

**1996 NCAA**

# **CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS**

---

90th Annual Convention ■ January 6-10, 1996 ■ Dallas, Texas

**National Collegiate Athletic Association**



NCAA LIBRARY

1996 NCAA

# CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

National Collegiate Athletic Association





THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

6201 College Boulevard  
Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422

913/339-1906

April 1996

**Edited By:** Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing.*

**Type/Layout:** Marcia L. Stubbeman, *Graphics/Typesetting.*

Distributed to chief executive officers, conference commissioners, affiliated and corresponding members.

NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

## Table of Contents

<b>I. Register 1996</b>	9
Administrative Organization	9
Convention Delegates, Visitors and Working Media	28
<b>II. Proceedings at the 90th NCAA Convention</b>	
Opening Business Session	61
Opening Remarks	61
Convention Committees	63
Report of the Council	64
Report of the Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics	65
Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee	67
State of the Association Address	69
Division I-A Business Session	74
Opening Remarks	74
Proposed Amendments	74
NCAA Membership Restructuring (No. 7)	74
Financial Aid — Summer School — Division I (No. 34)	75
Playing and Practice Seasons — First Contest Date — Divisions I and II Football (No. 79)	75
Postseason Bowl Certification — Minimum Wins (No. 90)	76
Personnel — Graduate Assistant Coach — Division I-A Football (No. 97)	76
Personnel — Graduate Assistant Coach — Division I-A Football (No. 98)	77
Official Visits — Division I Football (No. 118)	78
Reconsideration of Postseason Bowl Certification — Minimum Wins (No. 90)	79
Closing Remarks	79
Division I-AA Business Session	80
Opening Remarks	80
Report on Membership Restructuring	80
Proposed Amendments	88
NCAA Membership Restructuring (No. 7)	88
Playing and Practice Seasons — First Contest Date — Divisions I and II Football (No. 79)	89
Report of the Special Committee to Study NCAA Marketing	89
Discussion	91
Division I-AAA Business Session	94
Opening Remarks	94
Review of Proposed Amendments	94
Division II Business Session	95
Opening Remarks	95
Proposed Amendments	95
NCAA Membership Restructuring (No. 7)	95
Division II Athletics Certification (No. 16)	100
Initial-Eligibility — Partial Qualifier — Division II (No. 22)	108
Two-Year College Transfers — Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier — Division II (No. 26)	110



Resolution: Financial Aid in Division II (No. 29).....	113
De Minimus Violations — Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes (No. 43) .....	113
Expenses — Travel to Regular-Season Contests During Vacation Period — Divisions I and II (No. 49) .....	113
Promotional Activities (No. 133) .....	114
Financial Aid — Equivalency Figure for Books (No. 52) .....	114
Financial Aid — Multiple-Sport Participants — Division II (No. 55) .....	115
Eligibility for Practice — Minimum Full-Time Enrollment — United States Olympic Committee/National Governing Body Waiver (No. 56) .....	116
Eligibility — Seasons of Competition — Tennis (No. 57) .....	116
Core-Curriculum Requirements — Eighth-Grade Courses (No. 60) .....	120
Participation Prior to Initial-Eligibility Certification — Nonrecruited Student-Athletes — Women's Crew (No. 61) .....	121
Satisfactory Progress — Calculation of Grade-Point Average — Division II (No. 62) .....	122
Satisfactory Progress — Additional Waivers (No. 64) .....	123
Graduate Student — One-Time Transfer Exception (No. 65) .....	123
Subvarsity Eligibility — Division II (No. 66) .....	124
"4-2-4" Transfer Eligibility — Two-Year Nonparticipation Exception (No. 67) .....	124
Playing and Practice Seasons — Divisions I and II Tennis (No. 71) .....	125
First Contest Date and Contest Exemptions — Division II Basketball (No. 75) .....	125
Contest Exemptions — Softball (No. 77) .....	126
Playing and Practice Seasons — First Contest Date — Divisions I and II Football (No. 79) .....	126
Playing and Practice Seasons — Annual Exemptions — Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse and Softball (No. 73) .....	126
Playing and Practice Seasons — First Contest Date — Divisions I and II Soccer (No. 80) .....	127
Division II Football — Scheduling Requirement (No. 92) .....	128
Coaching Limitations and Playing and Practice Seasons — Emerging Sports for Women (No. 99) .....	128
Recruiting — Telephone Calls — Divisions I and II Basketball (No. 100) .....	128
Nominating Committee .....	129
Continuation of Division II Business Session .....	129
Opening Remarks .....	130
Proposed Amendments .....	130
Recruiting — Notes (No. 107) .....	130
Evaluations — State Tournaments — Division II (No. 108) .....	130
Printed Recruiting Materials — Preenrollment Information — Divisions I and II (No. 111) .....	131
Printed Recruiting Materials — Game Programs — Division II (No. 113) .....	131
Official Visits — Entertainment Allowance (No. 119) .....	131
Printed Recruiting Materials — Schedule Cards — Divisions I and II (No. 114) .....	132
Recruiting — Nonscholastic-Based Basketball (No. 120) .....	132

Division II Tryouts (No. 121) .....	132
Recruiting — Written Correspondence — Student-Athletes (No. 102) .....	133
Recruiting — Precollege Expense — Women's Crew (No. 123) .....	134
Reports .....	134
Championships Committee .....	134
Restructuring .....	136
Reconsideration of Voting Action .....	140
Reconsideration of Official Visits — Entertainment Allowance (No. 119) .....	140
Division III Business Session .....	142
Opening Remarks .....	142
Reports of Committees .....	142
Presidents Commission .....	142
Steering Committee .....	144
Proposed Amendments .....	145
NCAA Membership Restructuring (No. 7) .....	146
Playing and Practice Seasons — First On-Court Basketball Practice — Division III (No. 40) .....	148
Playing and Practice Seasons — Preseason Scrimmage — Division III Football (No. 41) .....	149
Discussion .....	150
Membership Restructuring .....	150
Continuation of Division III Business Session .....	152
Opening Remarks .....	152
Reports .....	152
Restructuring .....	152
Continuation of Division III Business Session .....	181
Opening Remarks .....	181
Reports of Committees .....	182
Championships .....	182
Proposed Amendments .....	184
De Minimus Violations — Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes (No. 43) .....	184
Eligibility for Practice — Minimum Full-Time Enrollment — United States Olympic Committee/National Governing Body Waiver (No. 56) .....	184
Playing and Practice Seasons — Annual Exemptions — Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer and Softball (No. 73) .....	185
Contest Limitations — Softball Tournaments — Division III (No. 83) .....	185
Coaching Limitations and Playing and Practice Seasons — Emerging Sports for Women (No. 99) .....	186
Recruiting — Precollege Expense — Women's Crew (No. 123) .....	186
Discussion .....	186
Restructuring .....	186
Nominating Committee .....	204
Closing Remarks .....	204
Division I Business Session .....	205
Opening Remarks .....	205
Proposed Amendments .....	205
NCAA Membership Restructuring (No. 7) .....	205
Resolution: NCAA Membership Restructuring (No. 9) .....	213
Resolution: Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct (No. 12) .....	215



Partial Qualifier — Division I (No. 19).....	215
Partial Qualifier — Division I (No. 18).....	220
Initial Eligibility — Partial Qualifier — Division I (No. 20).....	220
Initial Eligibility — Partial Qualifier — Division I (No. 21).....	225
Reconsideration of Partial Qualifier — Division I (No. 19).....	226
Two-Year College Transfers — Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier — Division I (No. 23).....	227
Two-Year College Transfers — Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier — Division I (No. 24).....	228
Two-Year College Transfer — Correspondence Courses (No. 27).....	229
Continuation of Division I Business Session.....	231
Opening Remarks.....	231
Proposed Amendments.....	231
De Minimus Violations — Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes (No. 43).....	231
Expenses — Travel to Regular-Season Contests During Vacation Period — Divisions I and II (No. 49).....	231
Recognition by Professional Sports Organization (No. 50).....	232
Promotional Activities (No. 133).....	232
Financial Aid — Equivalency Figure for Books (No. 52).....	233
Financial Aid — Division I Women's Sports (No. 54).....	233
Eligibility for Practice — Minimum Full-Time Enrollment — United States Olympic Committee/ National Governing Body Waiver (No. 56).....	234
Eligibility — Seasons of Competition — Tennis (No. 57).....	235
Participation After 21st Birthday (No. 58).....	237
Core-Curriculum Requirements — Eighth-Grade Courses (No. 60).....	237
Participation Prior to Initial-Eligibility Certification — Nonrecruited Student-Athletes — Women's Crew (No. 61).....	237
Satisfactory Progress — Additional Waivers (No. 64).....	239
Graduate Student — One-Time Transfer Exception (No. 65).....	240
Playing and Practice Seasons — Contest Exemptions — Division I (No. 69).....	240
Reconsideration of Participation Prior to Initial- Eligibility Certification — Nonrecruited Student- Athletes — Women's Crew (No. 61).....	243
Playing and Practice Seasons — Divisions I and II Tennis (No. 71).....	245
Contest Exemptions — Division I Basketball (No. 78).....	245
Playing and Practice Seasons — First Contest Date — Divisions I and II Soccer (No. 80).....	249
Waivers.....	249
Nominating Committee.....	249
NCAA Honors Dinner.....	250
Welcome.....	250
Invocation.....	250
Introductions.....	250
Today's Top VIII.....	251
Silver Anniversary Honorees.....	257
Theodore Roosevelt Award.....	262

Benediction.....	265
General Business Session.....	266
Opening Remarks.....	266
Proposed Amendments.....	266
NCAA Membership Restructuring (No. 7).....	266
Continuation of General Business Session.....	279
Opening Remarks.....	279
Reconsideration of Partial-Qualifier — Division I (No. 19).....	279
Reconsideration of Financial Aid — Summer School — Division I (No. 34).....	283
Proposed Amendments.....	285
Principle Governing Financial Aid (No. 10).....	285
Principle of Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct (No. 11).....	285
Unethical Conduct (No. 13).....	285
Unethical Conduct (No. 14).....	286
Ethical Conduct — Gambling (No. 15).....	286
Financial Aid — Division I (No. 28).....	287
Financial Aid — Division I Employment Earnings (No. 31).....	289
Financial Aid — Pell Grants — Division I (No. 33).....	291
Maximum Awards — Division I Men's Basketball (No. 35).....	292
Continuation of General Business Session.....	294
Reports.....	294
Supplemental Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee.....	294
Comments.....	294
Reconsideration of Voting Actions.....	295
Reconsideration of Financial Aid — Equivalency Figure for Books (No. 52).....	295
Proposed Amendments.....	297
Consent Package (Nos. 1-6).....	297
De Minimus Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes (No. 43).....	297
Amateurism — Competition With Professionals (No. 45).....	298
Exception for World Championships Participation (No. 46).....	298
Awards and Benefits — NCAA Championships and Bowl Games (No. 47).....	299
Athletically Related Employment Activities (No. 126).....	299
Financial Donations From Outside Organizations (No. 127).....	299
Awards — Insignia and Personalization (No. 128).....	300
Awards Limitations (No. 129).....	300
Awards — Special Events and Bowls (No. 130).....	300
Awards Banquets (No. 131).....	301
Foreign-Tour Expenses (No. 132).....	301
Financial Aid — Exempted Government Grants (No. 51).....	301
Full Grant-in-Aid — Supplies (No. 53).....	302
Academic Standing and Satisfactory Progress — Correspondence and Extension Courses (No. 63).....	302
Eligibility for Championships — Use of Banned Drugs (No. 68).....	303
National Collegiate Championship — Women's Crew (No. 84).....	303
Championships — Moratorium (No. 86).....	304
Championships — Minimum Sponsorship Criteria — Olympic Sports (No. 87).....	305
National Collegiate Championships — Size of Field (No. 88).....	306



Women's Softball Rules Committee (No. 93).....	307
Division I-AA Football Committee (No. 95) .....	308
Division II Women's Softball Committee (No. 96) .....	308
Committee Reports .....	309
Men's and Women's Committee on Committees .....	309
Nominating Committee .....	309
Proposed Amendments .....	309
Coaching Limitations and Playing and Practice Seasons — Emerging Sports for Women (No. 99) .....	309
Recruiting — Telephone Calls — Divisions I and II Basketball (No. 100) .....	311
Recruiting — Written Correspondence — Student-Athletes (No. 102) .....	312
Division I Basketball — Evaluation Days (No. 103) .....	312
Recruiting — Division I Basketball (No. 104) .....	313
Recruiting — Electronic Transmissions — Divisions I and II (No. 105) .....	314
Recruiting — Notes (No. 107) .....	314
Recruiting — Evaluations Subsequent to Signing — Division I (No. 110) .....	314
Printed Recruiting Materials — Preenrollment Information — Divisions I and II (No. 111) .....	315
Printed Recruiting Materials — Schedule Cards — Divisions I and II (No. 114) .....	315
Recruiting — Official Visits — Prior to Early Signing Period (No. 115) .....	316
Resolution: Certification for Early Official Visit (No. 117) .....	316
Official Visits — Entertainment Allowance (No. 119) .....	316
Recruiting — Nonscholastic-Based Basketball (No. 120) .....	317
Recruiting — Division I Basketball Event Certification (No. 122) .....	317
Recruiting — Precollege Expense — Women's Crew (No. 123) .....	318
Closing Remarks .....	318

### III. Appendices

A. Legislative Proposals .....	A-1
B. Roll-Call Voting .....	A-254
C. Convention Committees .....	A-274
D. Past Convention Sites .....	A-276
E. NCAA Officers, 1906-1996 .....	A-278

# Administrative Organization

## NCAA Administrative Organization

### NCAA Joint Policy Board

The Joint Policy Board consists of the Administrative Committee, listed below, and the officers of the Presidents Commission, as listed on page 16.

#### NCAA Staff Liaison:

Thomas W. Jernstedt (primary staff liaison)

Nancy L. Mitchell

### NCAA Administrative Committee

The Administrative Committee includes the NCAA officers (president, secretary-treasurer, division vice-presidents) and the NCAA executive director.

#### President

EUGENE F. CORRIGAN

Commissioner

Atlantic Coast Conference

6011 Landmark Center Boulevard

Greensboro, North Carolina 27407

(Term Expires January 1997\*)

#### Secretary-Treasurer

PHYLLIS L. HOWLETT

Assistant Commissioner

Big Ten Conference

1500 West Higgins Road

Park Ridge, Illinois 60068-6300

(Term Expires January 1997\*)

#### Executive Director

CEDRIC W. DEMPSEY

6201 College Boulevard

Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422

Division I Vice-President: William M. Sangster, Georgia Institute of Technology (Term Expires January 1996\*)

Division II Vice-President: Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University (Term Expires January 1997\*)

Division III Vice-President: Edward G. Coll Jr., Alfred University (Term Expires January 1996\*)

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position



## NCAA Council

The Council is elected by the annual Convention of the Association. The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members and serve as chair and secretary, respectively. The other 44 members of the Council shall include 22 members from Division I (including at least two chief executive officers and at least six women), 11 members from Division II (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women), and 11 members from Division III (including at least two chief executive officers and at least three women). The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the membership of that division present and voting at the division business session during the annual Convention. [Constitution 4.1.]

**Division Steering Committees:** The representatives of each division on the Council make up the steering committee for each division (i.e., Division I steering committee includes all members of Division I on the Council, Division II steering committee includes all members of Division II on the Council and Division III steering committee includes all members of Division III on the Council).

### Division I

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Robert A. Alost President Northwestern State University Natchitoches, Louisiana 71497-0003	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Robert J. Baugh Director of Athletics, Dean, College of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Eastern Kentucky University Richmond, Kentucky 40475-3101	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1997*
Carol A. Cartwright President Kent State University Kent, Ohio 44242	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1997
Richard J. Ensor Commissioner Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference 1090 Amboy Avenue Edison, New Jersey 08837-2847	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1998*
Joseph A. Etzel Director of Athletics University of Portland Portland, Oregon 97203-5798	I-AAA (Region 4)	Jan. 1998*

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Dennis A. Farrell  
Commissioner  
Big West Conference  
2 Corporate Park, Suite 206  
Irvine, California 92714

Jeremy N. Foley  
Director of Athletics  
University of Florida  
Gainesville, Florida 32604

Vivian L. Fuller  
Director of Athletics, Intramurals and  
Recreation  
Northeastern Illinois University  
5500 North St. Louis Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60625

Larry R. Gerlach  
Professor of History  
University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Mildred B. Griggs  
Dean, College of Education  
University of Illinois  
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Constance H. Hurlbut  
Executive Director  
Patriot League  
3897 Adler Place  
Building C, Suite 310  
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18017-9000

Jerry L. Kingston  
Professor of Economics  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, Arizona 85287-7706

Chris Monasch  
Commissioner  
Northeast Conference  
900 Route 9  
Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095

Sondra Norrell-Thomas  
Executive Assistant to the  
Vice-President for Student Affairs  
Howard University  
Washington, D.C. 20059

James P. O'Hanlon  
Dean, Teachers College  
University of Nebraska  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68588-0234

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position

I-A Jan. 1999\*  
Big West  
Conference  
(Region 4)

I-A Jan. 1999\*  
Southeastern  
Conference  
(Region 2)

I-AAA Jan. 1998\*  
(Region 3)

I-A Jan. 1998\*  
Western Athletic  
Conference  
(Region 4)

I-A Jan. 1997\*  
Big Ten  
Conference  
(Region 3)

I-At Large Jan. 1999\*  
(Region 1)

I-A Jan. 1996\*  
Pacific-10  
Conference  
(Region 4)

I-AAA Jan. 1996\*  
(Region 1)

I-At Large Jan. 1999\*  
(Region 1)

I-A Jan. 1998\*  
Big Eight  
Conference  
(Region 3)



Richard A. Rosenthal Director of Athletics University of Notre Dame Notre Dame, Indiana 46556	I-A Independent (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
William M. Sangster Director of International Programs Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0590	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1996*
Carol J. Sprague Senior Associate Director of Athletics University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213-0436	I-A Big East Conference (Region 1)	Jan. 1999*
Robert M. Sweazy Vice-Provost for Research Texas Tech University Lubbock, Texas 79409-1035	I-A Southwest Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*
Mary Jo Warner Senior Associate Director of Athletics George Washington University Washington, D.C. 20052	I-AAA (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Claudius E. Watts III President The Citadel Charleston, South Carolina 29409	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1997*
Kevin M. White Director of Athletics Tulane University New Orleans, Louisiana 70118	I-At Large (Region 2)	Jan. 1998*

#### Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Robert T. Becker Director of Athletics Saginaw Valley State University University Center, Michigan 48710 (Region 3)	Jan. 1998*
Rita M. Castagna Director of Athletics Assumption College Worcester, Massachusetts 01615-0005 (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*
Timothy J. Dillon Director of Athletics University of Alaska Anchorage Anchorage, Alaska 99508 (Region 4)	Jan. 1996

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Lynn L. Dorn Director of Women's Athletics North Dakota State University Fargo, North Dakota 58105-5600 (Region 4)	Jan. 1998*
Carol M. Dunn Director of Athletics California State University Los Angeles, California 90032-8240 (Region 4)	Jan. 1999*
Royce L. Money President Abilene Christian University Abilene, Texas 79601 (Region 4)	Jan. 1999*
David P. O'Toole Professor of Mathematics Bellarmine College Louisville, Kentucky 40205-0671 (Region 3)	Jan. 1997*
Shirley Green Reese Associate Director of Athletics Albany State College Albany, Georgia 31705 (Region 2)	Jan. 1997*
Diane L. Reinhard President Clarion University Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214 (Region 1)	Jan. 1997*
Barbara J. Schroeder Director of Athletics Regis University Denver, Colorado 80221-1099 (Region 4)	Jan. 1996
Will G. Shaw Chair, Department of Health and Physical Education Morehouse College Atlanta, Georgia 30314 (Region 2)	Jan. 1999*

#### Division III

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Bridget Belgiovine Director of Athletics University of Wisconsin La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601 (Region 4)	Jan. 1998*

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Administrative Organization



Daniel L. Bridges  
Director of Athletics  
California Institute of Technology  
Pasadena, California 91125  
(Region 4)

Stanley P. Caine  
President  
Adrian College  
Adrian, Michigan 49221-2575  
(Region 3)

Edward G. Coll Jr.  
President  
Alfred University  
Alfred, New York 14802-1232  
(Region 2)

Dennis M. Collins  
Executive Director  
North Coast Athletic Conference  
24700 Center Ridge Road #10  
Westlake, Ohio 44145  
(Region 3)

Mary Jo Gunning  
Director of Athletics  
Marywood College  
Scranton, Pennsylvania 18509  
(Region 2)

Linda E. Hopple  
Executive Director  
Middle Atlantic States Athletic Conference  
Lebanon Valley College  
101 North College Avenue  
Annville, Pennsylvania 17003-0501  
(Region 2)

Linda S. Moulton  
Director of Athletics  
Clark University  
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610-1477  
(Region 1)

Richard A. Rasmussen  
Executive Secretary  
University Athletic Association  
668 Mount Hope Avenue  
Rochester, New York 14620-2731  
(Region 2)

Lawrence R. Schiner  
Director of Athletics  
and Faculty Athletics Representative  
Jersey City State College

Jan. 1997\*

Jan. 1999\*

Jan. 1997\*

Jan. 1996\*

Jan. 1999\*

Jan. 1998\*

Jan. 1996\*

Jan. 1999\*

Jan. 1997\*

Jersey City, New Jersey 07305-1597  
(Region 1)

Robert E. Williams  
Director of Athletics  
Swarthmore College  
Swarthmore, Pennsylvania 19081-1397  
(Region 2)

#### NCAA Staff Liaison:

Cedric W. Dempsey (Executive Director)  
Nancy L. Mitchell (Council, primary staff liaison and Division I)  
Stephen A. Mallonee (Division II)  
Daniel T. Dutcher (Division III)  
Jacqueline Hudson (Council, Division I Recording Secretary)  
Carrie A. Hagwell (Division II Recording Secretary)  
Marybeth Ruskamp (Division III Recording Secretary)  
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)

Jan. 1998\*

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position



## Presidents Commission

The Presidents Commission is elected by a mail vote of the chief executive officers of all member institutions (or selected by the Division I-A conferences). The 44 members shall include 22 who shall represent Division I members, 11 who shall represent Division II members and 11 who shall represent Division III members. At least three women shall be included, preferably one from each division. The representatives of each division are elected for terms of four years by the chief executive officers of that division (or by the Division I-A conferences). The officers of the Presidents Commission are elected from among the members of the Commission by a majority vote of the Commission's members to serve for two years.

	Term as Chair Expires
Commission Chair: Judith E. N. Albino University of Colorado System	Jan. 1996*
Division I Chair: Samuel H. Smith Washington State University	Jan. 1998*
Division II Chair: Judith A. Ramaley Portland State University	Jan. 1997*
Division III Chair: David G. Carter Eastern Connecticut State University	Jan. 1997*

### Division I

Name, Institution	Representing	Term Expires
Judith E. N. Albino President University of Colorado System Boulder, Colorado 80309	I-A At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
Richard L. Bowen President Idaho State University Pocatello, Idaho 83209	I-AA West (Region 4)	Jan. 1996*
Rev. Albert J. DiUlio President Marquette University Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233	I-AAA At Large (Region 3)	Jan. 1999*
Ronald G. Eaglin President Morehead State University Morehead, Kentucky 40351-1689	I-AA Central (Region 2)	Jan. 1999*
Richard R. Eakin Chancellor East Carolina University Greenville, North Carolina 27858-4353	I-A Independent (Region 2)	Jan. 1999*

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position

E. Gordon Gee President Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210-1357	I-A Big Ten Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1996
Milton A. Gordon President California State University Fullerton, California 92634-9480	I-A Big West Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1999*
John C. Hitt President University of Central Florida Orlando, Florida 32816-0002	I-AA South (Region 2)	Jan. 1998*
Charles A. Kiesler Chancellor University of Missouri Columbia, Missouri 65211	I-A Big Eight Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1999*
William E. Kirwan President University of Maryland College Park, Maryland 20740	I-A Atlantic Coast Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1998*
Robert Lawless President Texas Tech University Lubbock, Texas 74909-2013	I-A Southwest Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1998*
J. Barton Luedeke President Rider University Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648-3099	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1998*
Richard E. Peck President University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico 87131	I-A Western Athletic Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*
Rev. Nicholas S. Rashford President St. Joseph's University Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19131	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1997*
E. Roger Sayers President University of Alabama Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487	I-A Southeastern Conference (Region 2)	Jan. 1996*
Brother Thomas J. Scanlan President Manhattan College Riverdale, New York 10471	I-AAA At Large (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position



Kenneth A. Shaw Chancellor Syracuse University Syracuse, New York 13244-1100	I-A Big East Conference (Region 1)	Jan. 1997*
William E. Shelton President Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197	I-A Mid-American Conference (Region 3)	Jan. 1997*
Samuel H. Smith President Washington State University Pullman, Washington 99164-1048	I-A Pacific-10 Conference (Region 4)	Jan. 1998*
William W. Sutton President Mississippi Valley State University Itta Bena, Mississippi 38941	I-AA At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*
Rev. David T. Tyson President University of Portland Portland, Oregon 97203-5798	I-AAA At Large (Region 4)	Jan. 1998*
To be appointed	I-AA East (Region 1)	Jan. 1997*

#### Division II

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Betty Turner Asher President University of South Dakota Vermillion, South Dakota 57069-2390 (Region 4)	Jan. 1999*
Robert A. Burnett President Armstrong State College Savannah, Georgia 31419-1997 (Region 2)	Jan. 1999*
Anthony F. Ceddia President Shippensburg University 1871 Old Main Drive Shippensburg, Pennsylvania 17257-2299 (Region 1)	Jan. 1998*
Joseph H. Hagan President Assumption College Worcester, Massachusetts 01615-0005 (Region 1)	Jan. 1996*

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Adam W. Herbert President University of North Florida Jacksonville, Florida 32224-2645 (Region 2)	Jan. 1998*
Gladys Styles Johnston Chancellor University of Nebraska at Kearney Kearney, Nebraska 68849 (Region 4)	Jan. 1997
Joseph J. McGowan Jr. President Bellarmine College Louisville, Kentucky 40205-0671 (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
Judith A. Ramaley President Portland State University Portland, Oregon 97207-0751 (Region 4)	Jan. 1997*
Wendell G. Rayburn President Lincoln University 820 Chestnut Jefferson City, Missouri 65101 (Region 3)	Jan. 1998*
Kent Wyatt President Delta State University Cleveland, Mississippi 38733 (Region 2)	Jan. 1996*
To be appointed	Jan. 1999*

#### Division III

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Michael F. Adams President Centre College Danville, Kentucky 40422-1394 (Region 3)	Jan. 1996*
David L. Beckley President Rust College Holly Springs, Mississippi 38635 (Region 3)	Jan. 1999*

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position



Robert J. Bruce  
President  
Widener University  
Chester, Pennsylvania 19013-5792  
(Region 2)

David G. Carter  
President  
Eastern Connecticut State University  
Willimantic, Connecticut 06226  
(Region 1)

Lois B. DeFleur  
President  
State University of New York  
Vestal Parkway East, Box 6000  
Binghamton, New York 13902-6000  
(Region 2)

Claire L. Gaudiani  
President  
Connecticut College  
New London, Connecticut 06320  
(Region 1)

Curtis L. McCray  
President  
Millikin University  
Decatur, Illinois 62522-2084  
(Region 4)

Michele Tolela Myers  
President  
Denison University  
Granville, Ohio 43023  
(Region 3)

L. Jay Oliva  
President  
New York University  
New York, New York 10012-1019  
(Region 2)

Irvin D. Reid  
President  
Montclair State University  
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043  
(Region 1)

John B. Slaughter  
President  
Occidental College  
Los Angeles, California 90041  
(Region 4)

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position

Jan. 1996\*

Jan. 1997\*

Jan. 1998\*

Jan. 1996\*

Jan. 1997\*

Jan. 1997\*

Jan. 1998\*

Jan. 1999\*

Jan. 1999\*

# NCAA Staff Liaison:

Cedric W. Dempsey (Executive Director)  
Stephen R. Morgan (Presidents Commission, primary staff liaison)  
Daniel Boggan Jr. (Division I)  
Stephen A. Mallonee (Division II)  
Daniel T. Dutcher (Division III)  
John H. Leavens (Recording Secretary)  
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position



## NCAA Executive Committee

The NCAA president and secretary-treasurer are ex officio members of the Executive Committee. The division vice-presidents shall be members, and the remaining nine members are elected by the Council for terms of five years. [Constitution 4.2.]

Division	Name, Institution	Term Expires
III	Mary R. Barrett Associate Director of Athletics University of Massachusetts Boston, Massachusetts 02125-3393	Jan. 1996*
III VP	Edward G. Coll Jr. President Alfred University Alfred, New York 14802-1232	Jan. 1996*
I-AAA	Susan A. Collins Senior Associate Director of Athletics George Mason University Fairfax, Virginia 22030	Jan. 2000*
Pres.	Eugene F. Corrigan Commissioner Atlantic Coast Conference 6011 Landmark Center Boulevard Greensboro, North Carolina 27407	Jan. 1997*
I-A	Joan C. Cronan Director of Women's Athletics University of Tennessee Knoxville, Tennessee 37996	Jan. 1997*
II VP	Lynn L. Dorn Director of Women's Athletics North Dakota State University Fargo, North Dakota 58105	Jan. 1997*
I-AA	Kenneth A. Free Commissioner Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference 102 North Elm Street, Suite 401 Greensboro, North Carolina 27401	Jan. 1996*
Sec.- Treas.	Phyllis L. Howlett Assistant Commissioner Big Ten Conference 1500 West Higgins Road Park Ridge, Illinois 60068-6300	Jan. 1997*
II	Jerry M. Hughes Director of Athletics Central Missouri State University Warrensburg, Missouri 64093	Jan. 1996*

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position

I VP (I-A)	William M. Sangster Director of International Programs Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0590	Jan. 1996*
I-A	Eugene D. Smith Director of Athletics Iowa State University Ames, Iowa 50011	Jan. 2000*
I-A	John D. Swofford Director of Athletics University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514	Jan. 2000*
I-AA	Patricia V. Viverito Commissioner, Gateway Football Conference and Pioneer Football League 1000 St. Louis Union Station, Suite 333 St. Louis, Missouri 63103	Jan. 2000*
I-A	Frank Windegger Director of Athletics Texas Christian University Fort Worth, Texas 76129-0001	Jan. 1998*

### NCAA Staff Liaison:

Cedric W. Dempsey (Executive Director)  
Thomas W. Jernstedt (Chief Operating Officer)  
Tricia Bork (Executive Committee, Division I, primary staff liaison)  
Dennis L. Poppe (Division II)  
Donna J. Noonan (Division III)  
Frank E. Marshall (Business Affairs)  
Lydia L. Sanchez (Meeting Arrangements)

\*Not eligible for reelection to this position



## NCAA National Office

### Management Team

Cedric W. Dempsey, *Executive Director*  
Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Deputy Executive Director/Chief Operating Officer*  
Daniel Boggan Jr., *Group Executive Director for Education Services*  
Tricia Bork, *Group Executive Director for Championships*  
Francis M. Canavan, *Group Executive Director for Public Affairs*  
Frank E. Marshall, *Group Executive Director for Finance and Business Services*  
Stephen R. Morgan, *Group Executive Director for Membership Services*

### Executive Affairs

Louis J. Spry, *Associate Executive Director*  
Robin J. Green, *Administrator for the Committee on Infractions*  
Lydia L. Sanchez, *Director of Executive Affairs*

### Championships Group

Daniel A. Calandro, *Director of Division I Men's Basketball Operations*  
William R. Hancock, *Director of Division I Men's Basketball Championship*  
Donna J. Noonan, *Director of Championships*  
Dennis L. Poppe, *Director of Championships*  
R. Wayne Burrow, *Assistant Director of Championships*  
Philip A. Buttafuoco, *Assistant Director of Championships*  
Carl E. Daniels, *Assistant Director of Championships*  
Thomas A. Jacobs, *Assistant Director of Championships*  
Bernard M. Muir, *Assistant Director of Division I Men's Basketball Championship*  
Deborah R. Nelson, *Assistant Director of Championships*  
Christine M. Pohl, *Assistant Director of Championships*  
Michelle A. Pond, *Assistant Director of Championships*  
Stann Tate, *Assistant Director of Championships*

### Education Services Group

Stanley D. Johnson, *Director of Professional Development*  
Janet M. Justus, *Director of Education Resources*  
Edward A. Thiebe, *Director of Youth Programs*  
Frank D. Uryasz, *Director of Sports Sciences*  
Ursula R. Walsh, *Director of Research*  
Sharon K. Cessna, *Youth Programs Coordinator*  
Timothy M. Clark, *Youth Programs Coordinator*  
Rochelle M. Collins, *Youth Programs Coordinator*  
Randall W. Dick, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*  
Donna L. Hockersmith, *Sports Sciences Program Coordinator*  
Todd A. Petr, *Assistant Director of Research*

Cindy A. Thomas, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*  
Emily R. Ward, *Life Skills Program Coordinator*

### Finance and Business Services Group

John E. Lamb, *Director of Aviation*  
Keith E. Martin, *Director of Accounting*  
Michael S. McNeely, *Director of Operations*  
Daniel W. Spencer, *Director of Data Processing*  
Karren L. Bishop, *Programmer/Analyst*  
Sarah T. Bobert, *Accountant*  
Allison Brown, *Programmer/Analyst*  
Kevin G. Clark, *Accountant*  
Dean I. Dautenhahn, *Programmer/Analyst*  
De Ann M. Demo, *Assistant Human Resources Manager*  
William C. Foreman, *Manager of Technical Services*  
Marla B. Gleason, *Manager of Support Services*  
Richard W. Hanson, *Programmer/Analyst*  
Rachelle L. Hooks, *Programmer/Analyst*  
Suzanne M. Kerley, *Human Resources Manager*  
Eugene M. Lamb, *Chief of Maintenance (Aviation)*  
Danny M. Roberts, *Programmer/Analyst*  
Fannie B. Vaughan, *Executive Assistant*

### Membership Services Group

S. David Berst, *Assistant Executive Director for Enforcement*  
John H. Leavens, *Assistant Executive Director for Compliance Services*  
Nancy L. Mitchell, *Assistant Executive Director for Legislative Services*  
Carrie A. Doyle, *Director of Eligibility Appeals*  
Daniel T. Dutcher, *Director of Legislative Services*  
Richard R. Hilliard, *Director of Enforcement*  
Mark P. Jones, *Director of Enforcement*  
David A. Knopp, *Director of Compliance Services*  
Kevin C. Lennon, *Director of Compliance Services*  
Stephen A. Mallonee, *Director of Legislative Services*  
Robert A. Oliver, *Director of Legislative Services*  
Charles E. Smrt, *Director of Enforcement*  
Dirk L. Taitt, *Director of Enforcement*  
Rebecca G. Bowman, *Compliance Representative*  
Jan A. Brown, *Enforcement Representative*  
David R. Brunk, *Compliance Representative*  
Carolyn M. Claude, *Compliance Representative*  
John T. Cochrane, *Enforcement Representative*  
Shepard C. Cooper, *Enforcement Representative*  
Melisa A. Dehon, *Eligibility Representative*  
Kevin R. Fite, *Eligibility Representative*



Jeffrey D. Freedman, *Enforcement Representative*  
 Cynthia J. Gabel, *Enforcement Representative*  
 Keith A. Gill, *Compliance Representative*  
 Carrie A. Hagwell, *Compliance Representative*  
 Stephanie J. Hannah, *Enforcement Representative*  
 Carolayne E. Henry, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Karl P. Hicks, *Enforcement Representative*  
 Thomas C. Hosty, *Enforcement Representative*  
 Jacqueline Hudson, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Shawna L. Hutchins, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Charles A. Jones, *Eligibility Representative*  
 Gary F. Karner, *Compliance Representative*  
 Edward B. Lupomech, *Enforcement Representative*  
 Shane Lyons, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Michael J. Marcil, *Compliance Representative*  
 Lori A. McQueen, *Enforcement Representative*  
 Louis A. Onofrio, *Eligibility Representative*  
 Amy P. Perko, *Enforcement Representative*  
 Richard C. Perko, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Les J. Pico, *Enforcement Representative*  
 N. Bea Pray, *Compliance Representative*  
 Garnett H. Purnell, *Compliance Representative*  
 Mike L. Racy, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Marybeth Ruskamp, *Legislative Assistant*  
 William S. Saum, *Enforcement Representative*  
 David W. Schnase, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Christopher D. Schoemann, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Christie A. Sexton, *Enforcement Representative*  
 Jennifer L. Shea, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Robert W. Thomas, *Compliance Representative*  
 David Thurkill, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Guy H. Troupe, *Enforcement Representative*  
 Shirley M. Whitacre, *Membership Coordinator*  
 Athena Yiamouyiannis, *Legislative Assistant*

#### **Public Affairs Group**

David E. Cawood, *Assistant Executive Director for  
Marketing and Broadcast Services*  
 Doris A. Dixon, *Director of Federal Relations*  
 Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing*  
 James A. Marchiony, *Director of Broadcast Services*  
 David Pickle, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*  
 Kathryn M. Reith, *Director of Public Information*  
 Wallace I. Renfro, *Director of Constituent Communication*  
 Vic Royal, *Director of Graphics*  
 Will J. Rudd, *Director of the Hall of Champions*

John T. Waters, *Director of Licensing*  
 Alfred B. White, *Director of Promotions*  
 James F. Wright, *Director of Statistics*  
 Marty Benson, *Publications Editor*  
 Laurie Bollig, *Publications Editor*  
 Theodore A. Breidenthal, *Publications Editor*  
 Gary T. Brown, *Publications Editor*  
 Richard M. Campbell, *Statistics Coordinator*  
 Jack L. Copeland, *Managing Editor, The NCAA News*  
 Leslie E. Drew, *Technical Director*  
 Stephen R. Hagwell, *Publications Editor*  
 Jeffrey S. Hiller, *Assistant Director of the Hall of Champions*  
 Kerwin E. Hudson, *Assistant Director of Broadcast Services*  
 Gary K. Johnson, *Statistics Coordinator*  
 Regina L. McNeal, *Assistant Director of Broadcast Services*  
 Ronald D. Mott, *Editorial and Advertising Assistant, The NCAA News*  
 Daniel A. Nestel, *Federal Relations Assistant*  
 Lee Newman, *Publishing Production Manager*  
 John D. Painter, *Statistics Coordinator*  
 Jennifer L. Scheibler, *Statistics Coordinator*  
 Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service, 119 West 57th  
Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019*  
 Kathy A. Short, *Circulation Manager*  
 Sean W. Straziscar, *Statistics Coordinator*  
 J. Gregory Summers, *Assistant Director of Publishing*  
 Cynthia M. Van Matre, *Assistant Director of Promotions*  
 Vikki K. Watson, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*







Binghamton, State University of New York at: Alicia G. Brewster, Lois B. DeFleur, Sheryl Sousa, Joel Thirer  
 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Mary Gardner, Preston Herring, Brian Johnson, Jessica S. Kozloff  
 Bluefield State College: John S. Duffy  
 Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Carol Ladwig, Marcia Wicklow-Howard  
 Boston College: Chester S. Gladchuk, Lynn K. Holleran, Kim Hollins, Joseph F. Quinn  
 Boston University: Averill C. Haines, Gary Strickler  
 Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson  
 Bowie State University: Charles A. Guilford  
 Bowling Green State University: Shelley Appelbaum, Calvin Bowers, Ken Kavanagh, Marvin L. Kumler, Sidney A. Ribeau, Ronald E. Zwierlein  
 Bradley University: John R. Brazil, Ron Ferguson, Dewey Kalmer, Ron Koperski  
 Brandeis University: Barbara Bickford, Jeffrey W. Cohen  
 Bridgewater College (Virginia): Thomas M. Kinder  
 Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): John C. Harper, Mike Storey  
 Brigham Young University: Rondo Fehlberg, Barbara Day Lockhart, Elaine Michaelis, Pete Witbeck  
 Brockport, State University College at: Linda J. Case, Susan Hoffman, Ginny L. Studer  
 Brown University: Julie Riccardelli, David T. Roach, Joan W. Taylor  
 Bryant College: Linda C. Hackett  
 Bryn Mawr College: Lisa Boyle, Lynne M. Kraskouskas, Jenepher P. Shillingford  
 Bucknell University: Rick Hartzell, Barbara A. Shailor, Timothy W. Sweeney  
 Buena Vista College: Roger Eglund  
 Buffalo, State University of New York at: Michael J. Gentile, Bridget Niland, Nelson E. Townsend, Robert J. Wagner  
 Buffalo, State University College at: Fred J. Hartrick  
 Butler University: Geoffrey Bannister, Jona Braden, John C. Parry

California, University of, Berkeley: Jack Citrin, Christine A. Dawson, John V. Kasser, Horace Mitchell, Chang-Lin Tien  
 California, University of, Davis: Pamela L. Gill-Fisher, Greg Warzecka  
 California, University of, Irvine: Khalid Channell, Daniel G. Guerrero, Jerry Henderson, Petrina M. Long, Lyman W. Porter  
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Tam Breckenridge, Rich Herczog, Donald G. Morrison  
 California, University of, Riverside: Robert W. Gill, Raymond L. Orbach, James J. Sims, Nancy Williams  
 California, University of, San Diego: J. Michael Hipp, Judith M. Sweet  
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: Steven Allaback, Gary A. Cunningham, Alice Henry  
 California, University of, Santa Cruz: Mark Majeski  
 California Institute of Technology: Daniel L. Bridges, Wendell P. Jack

California Lutheran University: Bruce Bryde, Carla DuPuis  
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Alison Cone, John F. McCutcheon, Michael J. Wenzl  
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Frank Gibbons, Karen L. Miller  
 California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, Brian McNamara  
 California State University, Chico: Anita Barker, Don W. Batie  
 California State University, Dominguez Hills: Harold Charnofsky, Louis Murdock, Ronald D. Prettyman  
 California State University, Fresno: Scott Johnson, Penni E. Key, Diane Milutinovich, Benjamin F. Quillian, Peter Simis  
 California State University, Fullerton: Judith A. Anderson, John Eastbrook, Leon Gilbert, Milton A. Gordon, Maryalyce Jeremiah  
 California State University, Hayward: Armando Gonzales, F. Douglas Weiss  
 California State University, Los Angeles: Carol M. Dunn, Fleur Yano  
 California State University, Northridge: Judith M. Brame, Paul A. Bubb, Robert J. Hiebert, Thomas J. Shannon  
 California State University, Sacramento: Lee A. McElroy, David Raske, Irene Shea, George H. Wayne  
 California State University, San Bernardino: Barry Knight, Todd S. Markel, Nancy Simpson  
 California State University, Stanislaus: Joseph T. Donahue, Marvalene Hughes, Wayne Pierce  
 California University of Pennsylvania: Karen Fetsko, Thomas G. Pucci  
 Calvin College: Beverly Klooster, Doris Zuideman  
 Cameron University: Bob Beumer, Don Davis, B. Don Sullivan, Kim Vinson, Robert L. Ziegler  
 Campbell University: Susan A. Berner, Tom Collins, L. T. Easley  
 Canisius College: Vincent M. Cooke, Kathryn E. Philliben, Daniel P. Starr  
 Capital University: James L. Burke  
 Carleton College: Leon Lunder  
 Carnegie Mellon University: John H. Harvey, Joan E. Maser  
 Carroll College (Wisconsin): Merle Masonholder  
 Carson-Newman College: Jerry Blaylock  
 Carthage College: Robert Bonn  
 Case Western Reserve University: Nancy Gray, David M. Hutter, Glenn Nicholls  
 Castleton State College: Martha K. Farmer, Natalie Hamilton  
 Catawba College: Ginger Crissman-Ashley  
 Catholic University: Jone Dowd  
 Centenary College (Louisiana): Harold Christensen, Russ Sharp, Kenneth L. Schwab  
 Central Arkansas, University of: Bill E. Stephens, Winfred L. Thompson  
 Central College (Iowa): Sam Bedrosian, Marjorie B. Giles, Kenneth J. Weller  
 Central Connecticut State University: Michael Ansarra, Robert F. Ariosto, Merle W. Harris, Charles Jones Jr., Frank R. A. Resnick  
 Central Florida, University of: William G. Callarman, John C. Hitt,



Mary J. Kaufman, Steve Sloan, Art W. Zeleznik  
 Central Michigan University: James W. Damitio, Herb Deromedi,  
 Leonard E. Plachta, Marcy Weston  
 Central Missouri State University: Ed Elliott, Paul H. Engelmann,  
 Jerry M. Hughes, Crista Troester  
 Central Oklahoma, University of: George Avellano, John E. Wagon  
 Centre College: Michael F. Adams, Kitty R. Baird, Ray Hammond, Bill  
 Johnston  
 Chadron State College: Samuel H. Rankin, Bradley R. Smith  
 Chaminade University: Brother Thomas Spring  
 Chapman University: Penny Brush, David Currey, Anthony Garcia  
 Charleston, College of (South Carolina): Jerry Baker, William V. Moore  
 Charleston, University of (West Virginia): Edwin H. Welch  
 Charleston Southern University: Tammy R. Craig, Steve Hudson  
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Andrew Hinson, Donald L. Mul-  
 lett  
 Chicago, University of: Starkey Duncan, Rosalie Resch, Lorna P.  
 Straus, Thomas Weingartner  
 Chicago State University: Barbara J. Farnandis, Joell B. Mitchell,  
 Christian D. Pope, Charles N. Smith  
 Cincinnati, University of: Nancy R. Hamant, Vincent G. Ille, Gerald K.  
 O'Dell, Jim Schaus  
 Citadel, The: Walter Nadzak, Col. Gerald L. Runey, Ed Steers, Lt.  
 Gen. Claudius E. Watts III  
 Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: David Wells  
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Robert Carlson, Tracy Cumming,  
 Diane L. Reinhard, Hal R. Wassink  
 Clark Atlanta University: Jean Bell Chandler, Richard Cosby, Philip  
 L. Hood  
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda S. Moulton  
 Clarkson University: William O'Flaherty  
 Clemson University: Constantine Curris, Cecil O. Huey Jr., Steven D.  
 Nelson, Dwight Rainey, Robert W. Robinson Jr., Linda White  
 Cleveland State University: John Konstantinos, Douglas O. Stewart,  
 Claire Van Ummersen  
 Coastal Carolina University: Jess Dannelly, Andy Hendrick, Linda  
 Hollandsworth, Ronald R. Ingle  
 Coker College: C. Timothy Griggs  
 Colby College: William R. Cotter, Earl H. Smith  
 Colby-Sawyer College: Debi Field McGrath, Lori Monroe  
 Colgate University: Braden Houston, Janet A. Little, Mark H. Mur-  
 phy, V. Martin Scarano  
 College Misericordia: Michael W. Mould  
 Colorado, University of, Boulder: Joyce Aschenbrenner, Rich Cardillo,  
 James N. Corbridge Jr., Bill Marolt, Roderic B. Park  
 Colorado, University of, Colorado Springs: Theophilus D. Gregory,  
 Linda Bunnell Shade  
 Colorado Christian University: Dave Foster, Linda Rush, Ronald R.  
 Schmidt, Michael Sumpter  
 Colorado College: Roxanne Dale, Maxwell F. Taylor  
 Colorado School of Mines: John A. Hogan, Marvin L. Kay

Colorado State University: Tom Jurich, Marsha Smeltzer, Christine  
 Susemihl  
 Columbia University-Barnard College: Jacqueline P. Blackett, Merry  
 L. Ormsby, John A. Reeves  
 Columbus College: Frank D. Brown  
 Concord College: Ron Burgher  
 Concordia College, Moorhead: Armin Pipho  
 Connecticut, University of: John L. Allen, Pat Babcock, Noreen Mor-  
 ris, Lewis Perkins, Cindy Pittner  
 Connecticut College: Robert Malekoff  
 Coppin State College: Clayton McNeill  
 Cornell College: Ellen Whale  
 Cornell University: Virginia Augusta, M. Dianne Murphy  
 Cortland, State University College at: Dolores A. Bogard, A. Lee  
 Roberts, Judson H. Taylor  
 Creighton University: C. Timothy Dickel, Mary Higgins, Bruce D. Ras-  
 mussen

Daniel Webster College: Philip A. Rowe  
 Dartmouth College: Megan Drucker, Jo Ann Harper, Jo-Ann Nester,  
 M. Lee Pelton  
 Davidson College: Thomas A. Kazee, John W. Kuykendall, Sterling T.  
 Martin Jr.  
 Davis and Elkins College: Will Shaw  
 Dayton, University of: George A. Bohlen, R. Elaine Dreidame, Ted  
 Kissell  
 Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Mary Ann Hitchens,  
 Edgar N. Johnson, David P. Roselle  
 Delaware State University: William Collick, William B. DeLauder,  
 Tommy L. Frederick, Robert "Tony" O'Neal  
 Delaware Valley College: Frank Wolfgang  
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, Jim Jordan, Kent Wyatt  
 Denison University: F. Trevor Gamble, Larry Scheiderer  
 Denver, University of: Phillip Hogue, Bernard Mullin, Daniel L.  
 Ritchie, Nancy S. Sampson, Diane T. Wendt  
 DePaul University: William D. Bradshaw, Jeanne LaDuke, Jean Lenti  
 Ponsetto  
 Detroit Mercy, University of: Brad Bertani, Sister Maureen A. Fay, Pa-  
 tricia Kellstrom, Brad Kinsman, Martha Soleau  
 Dickinson College: Leslie J. Poolman  
 District of Columbia, University of: Emma J. Best, Dwight F. Datcher  
 Dowling College: Robert Dranoff  
 Drake University: Donald Adams, Jean Berger, Lynn King, Susan E.  
 Wright  
 Drew University: Vincent Masco, Connee Zotos  
 Drexel University: Anthony T. Caneris, Louis M. Marciani, Patricia L.  
 McClellan, Constantine N. Papadakis  
 Drury College: Dan Cashel, Penny Clayton, Bruce Harger, John E.  
 Moore Jr.  
 Dubuque, University of: Connie Bandy Hodge  
 Duke University: Christopher Kennedy, Thomas A. Spragens Jr.

*Delegates and Visitors*



Duquesne University: William P. Buzzi, Brian Colleary

Earlham College: Porter G. Miller, Sharon Nolan

East Carolina University: Richard R. Eakin, Mike Hamrick, Ernest Schwarz, Rosie Thompson

East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Norman J. Bailey, Earl W. Edwards, Roger L. Gill, Diane Husic, Carey J. Snyder

East Tennessee State University: Patrick Britz, Charles E. Clark, H. Keener Fry Jr.

East Texas State University: Margaret Harbison, Donald A. Ingold, Jerry D. Morris, Kayla Peak

Eastern College: Barbara Martin Herzlich

Eastern Connecticut State University: Jacqueline Abbott, David G. Carter, Sharlene A. Peter

Eastern Illinois University: David L. Jorns, Robert D. McBee, Ron Paap, Deborah M. Polca, Gail J. Richard, Jerome P. Rodgers

Eastern Kentucky University: Robert J. Baugh, H. Hanly Funderburk Jr.

Eastern Mennonite College: Lester R. Zook

Eastern Michigan University: John R. Adams, Carole J. Huston, Juanita M. Reid, William E. Shelton, Tim L. Weiser

Eastern New Mexico University: Thurman Elder, Chris C. Gage

Eastern Washington University: Marshall Drummond, John Johnson, Frank E. Nelson

Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: Todd W. Henne, Todd V. Jay

Elizabeth City State University: Edward McLean, William A. Porter

Elizabethtown College: Nancy J. Latimore

Elmhurst College: Christopher M. Ragsdale

Elon College: Robert C. Hassard, Vicki Hightower, Alan J. White

Emerson College-Massachusetts College of Art: Joseph T. Walsh

Emory University: Steven Batterson, Cathy Benton, Chuck Gordon, Sandy Tillman

Emporia State University: Robert E. Glennen, Wilma Kasnic, William W. Quayle, John C. Rich

Endicott College: Nancy J. Bals

Erskine College: Wilbur H. Reames Jr.

Eureka College: H. Warner McCollum

Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, J. Robert Knott, Laura Tietjen, James S. Vinson

Fairfield University: Eugene P. Doris, Tracey Flynn

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: William T. Klika Jr., Carl Viola

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Paul Huegel, Gerald A. Oswald, Richard Panicucci, Ann Gulino Thompson

Fairmont State College: Colin T. Cameron

Fayetteville State University: Ralph E. Burns

Ferris State University: Jill Hirschinger, Tom Kirinovic, Mark Kosciuszko, Larry Marfise

Ferrum College: Ted M. Kinder

Fisk University: William P. Hytche Jr.

Fitchburg State College: Ann E. Coyne

Florida, University of: Jean Chance, Jeremy N. Foley, John V. Lombardi, E. James McCloskey, Ann Marie Rogers

Florida A&M University: Mickey Clayton, Cynthia Dupont-Jones, Frederick S. Humphries, Ken Riley

Florida Atlantic University: James Brewer, Thomas Cargill, Joan Joyce, Emmanuel Newsome

Florida Institute of Technology: William K. Jurgens

Florida International University: Theodore A. Aceto, Joyce Elam

Florida Southern College: Chuck Anderson, Hal Smeltzly, Lois Webb

Florida State University: Charles L. Carr, Talbot D'Alemberte, Charles W. Ehrhardt, David R. Hart Jr., Robert J. Minnix, Kim Record

Fontbonne College: Dennis C. Golden, Lee McKinney

Fordham University: George Bisacca, Francis X. McLaughlin, Marianne Reilly

Fort Hays State University: Edward H. Hammond, Glen F. McNeil, Thomas E. Spicer

Fort Lewis College: Joel M. Jones, Harlan Steinle

Fort Valley State College: Douglas T. Porter, Gwendolyn Reeves

Framingham State College: Lawrence P. Boyd

Francis Marion College: Gerald Griffin, Lee A. Vickers

Franklin and Marshall College: John Andrew, Patricia W. Epps, William A. Marshall

Franklin Pierce College: Bruce Kirsch

Fredonia, State University College at: Charles Davis, William E. Leslie, Thomas E. Prevet

Frostburg State College: Loyal K. Park

Furman University: John M. Block, David E. Shi, Bob Warming

Gallaudet University: Peg Worthington

Gannon University: Howard Elwell, Ronald F. Pauline

Gardner-Webb University: Anthony F. Eastman, Ozzie McFarland, Jeff Tubbs

Geneseo, State University College at: Karen L. Pennington, John L. Spring

George Mason University: Susan A. Collins, Michael G. Emsley, Thomas J. O'Connor

George Washington University: Edward A. Caress, Robert A. Chernak, Susie Jones, Jack Kvancz, Mary Jo Warner

Georgetown University: Adam Brick, Joseph Lang, Patricia A. Thomas

Georgia, University of: Gary Couvillon, Vincent J. Dooley, Elizabeth Murphey, Hoke Wilder

Georgia College: Stan Aldridge, Jerry Fly, Bruce Harshbarger, Edwin G. Speir Jr.

Georgia Institute of Technology: G. Wayne Clough, Bernadette V. McGlade, James E. Murphy III, Ida Neal, George Nemhauser, Homer C. Rice

Georgia Southern University: Sam Baker, Brenda S. Carter, Hank Schomber, G. Lane Van Tassell

Georgia State University: Blaine Hughes, James H. Maxey, Orby Moss

*Delegates and Visitors*



Jr., Carl V. Patton  
 Gettysburg College: Charles W. Winters  
 Glenville State College: Kenneth Osborne  
 Gonzaga University: John J. Preston  
 Gordon College: Walter Bowman  
 Goucher College: Geoffrey M. Miller, Debra Sherwin  
 Grambling State University: Wilbert Ellis, Raymond A. Hicks, Fred C. Hobdy, A. Lane Howell  
 Grand Canyon University: B. Keith Baker  
 Grand Valley State University: Joan Boand, Michael J. Kovalchik, Danielle S. Tiernan, Ron Van Steeland, Donald W. VanderJagt  
 Grinnell College: Diane Fairchild  
 Grove City College: R. Jack Behringer  
 Guilford College: Laura Klingseisen  
 Gustavus Adolphus College: James M. Malmquist

Hamilton College: Geri Knortz  
 Hampden-Sydney College: Joe Bush  
 Hampton University: Lenora E. Armstrong, Dennis Thomas  
 Hanover College: Dick Naylor, Russell L. Nichols  
 Hardin-Simmons University: John Neese  
 Hartford, University of: Jennifer Heppel, Patricia H. Meiser-McKnett, S. Edward Weinswig  
 Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler  
 Harvard University: William J. Cleary Jr., Patricia Henry, Harry R. Lewis, Marcella K. Zalot  
 Haverford College: Penelope C. Hinckley  
 Hawaii, University of, at Hilo: William R. Trumbo  
 Hawaii, University of, Manoa: Brandi Lee Brooks, James J. Donovan III, Kaia Hedlund, Stephen L. Martin, Marilyn Moniz-Kahoonahano, Hugh Yoshida  
 Heidelberg College: Martin Reno  
 Henderson State University: Charles D. Dunn, David Gardner, Kenneth J. Turner  
 Hendrix College: Ann H. Die  
 Hillsdale College: Mickey Craig, Jack H. McAvoy  
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Susan Bassett, Joseph M. Berta, Michael J. Hanna  
 Hofstra University: J. Richard Block, James V. Garvey, Cindy Lewis, James M. Shuart  
 Hollins College: Lynda J. Calkins  
 Holy Cross College: Rev. John E. Brooks, Ronald S. Perry, Rose Shea, Ann Zelesky  
 Hope College: Anne Irwin, Raymond E. Smith  
 Houston, University of: William C. Carr, Glenn A. Goerke, Diane Howell, Bill McGillis, Richard W. Scamell  
 Howard Payne University: Larry Nickell  
 Howard University: Steve Favors, Morris Hawkins Jr., Deborah K. Johnson, Sondra Norrell-Thomas, Altha B. Williamson  
 Humboldt State University: Gail J. Fults, Dennis L. Geyer, Scott Nelson

Hunter College: Terry A. Wansart

Idaho, University of: Kathy D. Clark, Pete Liske, David Van Over  
 Idaho State University: Nancy Graziano, Cornelius A. Hofman, Kelley Wiltbank  
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: Michael Aiken, Rick Allen, David L. Chicoine, Mildred B. Griggs, Ronald E. Guenther, Karol A. Kahrs, James Stukel  
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: Tonya M. McGowan, James W. Schmidt, Kenneth E. Surma, Barbara S. Wood  
 Illinois Benedictine College: John P. Welty  
 Illinois College: Richard A. Johanningmeier  
 Illinois State University: Richard Greenspan, Linda G. Herman, Albert Otto, David A. Strand  
 Illinois Wesleyan University: Barbara Cothren  
 Indiana State University: Larry Gallo Jr., John C. Jessell, Andrea Myers  
 Indiana University, Bloomington: Clarence H. Doninger, William C. Perkins, Mary Ann Rohleder  
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Cignetti, Harold "Pete" Goldsmith, Frances A. Nee, Lawrence K. Pettit, John C. Thomas  
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Robert A. Barrett, Daniel L. Gebhart  
 Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis: William N. Kulsrud, Hugh Wolf  
 Indianapolis, University of: Kenneth D. Borden, William A. Bright, David Huffman  
 Iona College: Gai Berlage, Rich Petriccione  
 Iowa, University of: Robert Bowsby, Mary Sue Coleman, Christine H. B. Grant, Yvonne L. Slatton  
 Iowa State University: Norman L. Boyles, J. Elaine Hieber, Martin C. Jischke, Eugene D. Smith  
 Ithaca College: Robert C. Deming, Bonnie J. Gordon, James J. Whalen  
 Jackson State University: Paul E. Covington, Melvin I. Evans, James E. Lyons, Sadie E. Magee  
 Jacksonville State University: Debra Bishop, Jerry N. Cole, Hope P. Davis, Harold J. McGee, Marilyn Osborne, Don Thacker  
 Jacksonville University: Catherine Morgan, Thomas M. Seitz  
 James Madison University: Donald L. Lemish, Janet D. Lucas, Dennis E. Robison  
 Jersey City State College: Lawrence R. Schiner  
 John Carroll University: Gretchen Weitbrecht  
 John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Susan Larkin  
 Johns Hopkins University: Thomas P. Calder, Tim Downes  
 Johnson C. Smith University: Debra D. Frazier  
 Juniata College: Larry Bock, Jill M. LaPoint, Robert W. Neff  
 Kalamazoo College: Marilyn A. Maurer  
 Kansas, University of: Robert E. Frederick, Janelle Martin, Delbert M. Shankel, Betsy G. Stephenson



Kansas State University: Jim Epps, Cindy Fox, Robert S. Krause, Robert R. Snell, Max F. Urick, Jon Wefald  
 Kean College: Patricia Hannisch, Glenn Hedden  
 Keene State College: John C. Ratliff  
 Kennesaw State College: Dave Waples  
 Kent State University: Carol A. Cartwright, Judy Devine, Laing E. Kennedy, William Konnert  
 Kentucky, University of: Virginia A. Atwood, Sandra D. Bell, C. M. Newton, Charles T. Wethington Jr.  
 Kentucky State University: Betty M. Gibson, Donald W. Lyons, Cassie Osborne Jr.  
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: William J. Meadors, Wesley H. Poling, James E. Welch  
 Kenyon College: Robert D. Bunnell  
 King's College: John J. Dorish, Eugene Gorski, Cheryl Ish  
 Knox College: Harlan Knosher  
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Anthony A. Matz, David McFarland, Betty Wesner

La Salle University: Brother Joseph F. Burke, Kathleen M. McNally, Robert Mullen, Annette O'Connor  
 La Verne, University of: Jimmy M. Paschal, Rick Simon  
 Lafayette College: Eve Atkinson, Bruce E. McCutcheon  
 Lake Forest College: Jackie A. Slaats  
 Lake Superior State University: William Crawford, Charles W. Jones, Jill Wetthuhn  
 Lamar University: Hsing-Wei Chu, Rex L. Cottle, Michael E. O'Brien  
 Lander College: William C. Moran, Betty H. Williams  
 Lane College: J. L. Perry  
 Le Moyne College: Richard W. Rockwell  
 Lebanon Valley College: Louis A. Sorrentino, Kathleen Tierney  
 Lees-McRae College: Ried M. Estus  
 Lehigh University: Karen Adams, Peter Likins, Joseph D. Sterrett  
 Lehman College: Martin L. Zwiren  
 LeMoyne-Owen College: Earl Vinson, E. D. Wilkens  
 Lenoir-Rhyne College: Rufus L. Moretz, Keith Ochs, Joe Smith  
 Lewis University: Raphael Mascari, Paul Ruddy  
 Liberty University: Chuck Burch, Kim Graham, William Gribbin, A. Pierre Guillermin  
 Lincoln Memorial University: Scott D. Miller  
 Lincoln University (Missouri): Ronald E. Coleman, Mary Beth Ochsner, Wendell G. Rayburn, David L. Shinholster  
 Livingstone College: Clifton Huff  
 Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Sharon E. Taylor  
 Long Beach State University: David Bernstein, Cindy Masner, David P. O'Brien, Mary Ann Tripodi  
 Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus: Margaret Alaimo, James Martin, Bernard W. Sullivan  
 Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Vincent Salamone  
 Longwood College: Tom Bilello, William F. Dorrill, Wayne E. McWee, Jack E. Williams

Loras College: Daniel J. Allen, Robert G. Bierie  
 Louisiana State University: David Bahnsen, Pat Culbertson, William E. Davis, Joe Dean  
 Louisiana Tech University: Jerry W. Andrews, Mary Kay Hungate, Jim M. Oakes, Daniel D. Reneau  
 Louisville, University of: Kevin Miller, William C. Olsen, Arthur M. Riehl  
 Loyola College (Maryland): Diane M. Aikens, Bill M. Donovan, Rev. Harold E. Ridley, James Smith  
 Loyola Marymount University: Brian Quinn  
 Loyola University (Illinois): Carolyn V. O'Connell, Samuel P. Ramenofsky, Charles T. Schwarz  
 Luther College: Joe Thompson  
 Lynchburg College: Jack M. Toms  
 Lynn University: Jennifer Braaten, James D. Matthews, Richard A. Young

Macalester College: Kenneth W. Andrews  
 Maine, University of: Frederick E. Huthinson, George L. Jacobson, Tammy Light, Suzanne J. Tyler  
 Maine Maritime Academy: William Mottola  
 Manchester College: Tom Jarman, Martha Judge  
 Manhattan College: Robert J. Byrnes, E. Joseph Lee, Brother Thomas J. Scanlan, Sandra Sapone  
 Manhattanville College: Karen Peterson  
 Mankato State University: Don Amiot, Georgene Brock, Margaret Healy, Ronald L. Hybertson, Richard R. Rush  
 Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Roger N. Maisner  
 Marietta College: Jeanne Arbuckle, Lauren R. Wilson  
 Marist College: Timothy S. Murray, John T. Ritschdorff, Alison Sexton  
 Maritime College, State University of New York: James Migli  
 Marquette University: William L. Cords, Rev. Albert J. DiUlio, Greg Naples, Kathryn Statz  
 Mars Hill College: Ed Hoffmeyer  
 Marshall University: Sterling R. Brown, Barbara Burke, Robert Sawrey, Lance West  
 Mary Baldwin College: Kathy McCleaf  
 Maryland, University of, Baltimore County: Charles R. Brown, Freeman Hrabowski, John A. Kloetzel, Kathleen G. Zerrlaut  
 Maryland, University of, College Park: Danita DeHaney, William E. Kirwan, Betty F. Smith, Deborah A. Yow  
 Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Henry M. Brooks, Hallie E. Gregory, Darryl Pope  
 Maryville University of St. Louis: Julie Beckerman, Lonnie Folks, Keith Lovin, David R. Pierce  
 Marywood College: Mary Jo Gunning  
 Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: Daniel E. Bogan, Howard M. Davis, Robert K. Marcum, David K. Scott, Elaine Sortino, Glenn M. Wong  
 Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Mary Barrett, Charlie Titus  
 Massachusetts, University of, Dartmouth: Robert A. Dowd



Massachusetts, University of, at Lowell: Jon C. Hellstedt, Dana K. Skinner  
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Thomas J. Allen Jr., Richard A. Hill, Candace L. Royer  
 Massachusetts Maritime Academy: Robert Corradi  
 McNeese State University: Tommy E. Bogle, Robert G. Hayes, Robert D. Hebert, Ron LeLeux  
 Memphis, University of: Donald Carson, Wilson L. Dietrich, Lynn Parkes, V. Lane Rawlins, Timothy L. Sumner  
 Mercer University: R. Kirby Godsey, Benjamin S. Kelley, Bobby Pope  
 Mercy College: Neil D. Judge  
 Mercyhurst College: Peter J. Russo  
 Merrimack College: Robert M. DeGregorio Jr., Joseph T. Kelley  
 Mesa State College: James F. Paronto  
 Messiah College: Lori L. Braa, Layton Shoemaker  
 Metropolitan State College of Denver: Joseph Arcese, William Helman, Joel R. Smith Jr.  
 Miami, University of (Florida): Craig W. Angelos, Paul Dee, Edward T. Foote II, Clyde B. McCoy, Lawrence G. Wahl  
 Miami University (Ohio): Anne H. Hopkins, Eric Hyman, Harold W. Jasper, Karen Womack  
 Michigan, University of: Percy Bates, Margaret J. Bradley-Doppes, James J. Duderstadt, Craig Keilitz, Joe Roberson, John Seyferth Jr.  
 Michigan State University: Michael L. Kasavana, Kathy Lindahl, Merritt J. Norvell Jr., Clarence Underwood Jr.  
 Michigan Technological University: Mary Kaminski, Darrell W. Smith, Curtis J. Tompkins, J. Richard Yeo  
 Middle Tennessee State University: Race P. Bergman, Lee G. Fowler, Diane C. Turnham, James E. Walker  
 Middlebury College: G. Thomas Lawson  
 Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Gene A. Carpenter, Gary Reighard, Marjorie A. Trout  
 Millikin University: Merle W. Chapman, Lori Kerans, Curtis L. McCray  
 Mills College: Helen Carroll  
 Millsaps College: George M. Harmon, Ron Jurney  
 Milwaukee School of Engineering: Daniel I. Harris  
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Gregory Fox, Linda Larson, Patricia A. Merrier  
 Minnesota, University of, Morris: Mark Fohl, David C. Johnson  
 Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: Norman Chervany, Judith Davidson, Mark Dienhart, Frank Kara, Jeff Schemmel, Mariah Snyder, Chris Voelz  
 Mississippi, University of: James T. "Pete" Boone, Robert C. Khayat, Kathryn R. Strickland, David K. Wells, Max W. Williams  
 Mississippi College: Terry McMillan, Sid Moller, Howell W. Todd  
 Mississippi State University: David C. Boles, Samye Johnson, Walter B. Newsom, Larry O. Templeton, Donald W. Zacharias  
 Mississippi University for Women: Clyda S. Rent, Jo Spearman  
 Mississippi Valley State University: John E. Johnson, Charles Prophet, William W. Sutton

Missouri, University of, Columbia: Joseph R. Castiglione, Derrick Gragg, Charles A. Kiesler, Sarah K. Reesman, Carl Settergren  
 Missouri, University of, Kansas City: J. Joseph Doerr, Ed Grom  
 Missouri, University of, Rolla: Lawrence O. Christensen, Mark E. Mullin, Wendell R. Ogrosky  
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Patricia A. Dolan, Sandy MacLean, Thomas R. Schnell, Denise Silvester, Blanche M. Touhill  
 Missouri Southern State College: Sallie Beard, Jim Frazier, Bernard A. Johnson, Julio S. Leon  
 Missouri Western State College: James W. Grechus, Don Kaverman, Janet G. Murphy, Mary M. Nichols  
 Molloy College: Robert C. Houlihan  
 Monmouth College (New Jersey): Joan Martin, Marilyn McNeil, Marilyn A. Parker  
 Montana, University of: George M. Dennison, Wayne Hogan, James J. Lopach  
 Montana State University-Billings: Gary R. Gray, Russell Lord, Eric Schoh  
 Montana State University-Bozeman: Susan M. Jacobson, Charles N. Lindemann, Michael P. Malone, Robert G. Oakberg, Allen Yarnell  
 Montclair State University: Holly P. Gera, Gregory L. Lockard, Irvin D. Reid  
 Moorhead State University: Tammy Blake, Steven V. Butler, Katy Wilson  
 Moravian College: John Makuvek  
 Morehead State University: W. Michael Brown, Ronald G. Eaglin, Steve Hamilton, Kathleen R. Worthington  
 Morehouse College: Willie G. Shaw  
 Morgan State University: Delise O'Meally, Tanya V. Rush, Charles R. Salters  
 Morningside College: Bill Goldring, Jerry Israel, Joan McDermott, Molly Williams  
 Morris Brown College: Beverly Arnaud, Gene Bright, Johnnie D. Myers  
 Mount Holyoke College: Laurie Priest, Lynne Wilkie  
 Mount Olive College: Willis A. Brown Jr., Allen M. Cassell  
 Mount St. Mary College (New York): John J. Wright  
 Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland): Carol Hinds, Harold P. Menninger, Lynne Robinson, George H. Williams  
 Mount Union College: Truman Turnquist  
 Muhlenberg College: Greg Olejack, Kurt M. Thiede  
 Murray State University: Margaret Simmons, Michael D. Strickland  
 Muskingum College: Steve Kokovich

Nazareth College: William H. Carey  
 Nebraska, University of, at Kearney: Richard M. Dull, Gladys Styles Johnston, Brent W. Robinson, Patty Sitorius  
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Don Bryant, William Byrne, Theodore Harris, Barbara A. Hibner, Joan R. Leitzel, James P. O'Hanlon, Al Papik, Heidi J. Wall  
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Connie J. Claussen, Bob Danen-



hauer, Richard B. Flynn, Don Leahy, Del D. Weber  
 Nebraska Wesleyan University: Timothy Anderson, Christy J. Wilson  
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Charles Cavagnaro, David Chambers, Carol C. Harter, Lisa A. Kelleher, Myrlene LaMancusa  
 Nevada, University of: Chris Ault, Joseph N. Crowley, Christopher H. Exline, Angela D. Taylor  
 New England College: Mary Allen Alger  
 New Hampshire, University of: Gilbert Chapman, John H. Lawson, David O'Connor, Walter R. Peterson, Judith L. Ray  
 New Hampshire College: Joseph R. Polak  
 New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, Robin Salters  
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: James Catalano  
 New Mexico, University of: Rudy Davalos, Robert J. Desiderio, Linda K. Estes, Richard E. Peck  
 New Mexico Highlands University: Robert N. Evers  
 New Mexico State University: Karen Fey, Albert T. Gonzales, J. Michael Orenduff  
 New Orleans, University of: Sybil A. Boudreaux, Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien, Karen D. Whalen  
 New Paltz, State University College at: James A. Zalacca  
 New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache  
 New York Institute of Technology: Clyde Doughty Jr.  
 New York University: Gregory Belinfanti, Barnett W. Hamberger, L. Jay Oliva, Daniel E. Quilty  
 Newberry College: William Grafton Young Jr.  
 Niagara University: Paul L. Golden, Barbara A. Green, Michael L. Jankowski  
 Nicholls State University: Donald Ayo, Deanna Falcon, Michael G. Knight, Lance J. Poimboeuf  
 Nichols College: Thomas R. Cafaro  
 Norfolk State University: William D. Price, Delanyard Robinson, P. LaVerne Sweat  
 North Adams State College: Scott J. Kalicki  
 North Alabama, University of: Robert L. Potts, Dan Summy  
 North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Thomas B. Hunnicutt, Eric Iovacchini, David Mitchell, Patsy B. Reed, Robert D. Yearout  
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Richard A. Baddour, John P. Evans, Beth Miller, John D. Swofford  
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: Philip Dubois, David Goldfield, Kimberly Green, Judy W. Rose, James H. Woodward  
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: James H. Allen, Nelson E. Bobb, Harold G. Hall III, David B. Knight, Patricia A. Sullivan  
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: Lea Dudley, Pat Howey, Paul A. Miller  
 North Carolina A&T State University: Dorothy J. Alston, Willie J. Burden, Edward B. Fort, James A. Williams Jr.  
 North Carolina Central University: Les Brinson, Patricia M. Durham, William E. Lide, Faith Shearer, Sandra T. Shuler  
 North Carolina State University: Arthur W. Cooper, William Haigh, Harold N. McElhaney, James D. Miller, William T. "Todd" Turner  
 North Central College: Walter J. Johnson, Harold R. Wilde

North Dakota, University of: Kendall L. Baker, Kathleen McCann, Pete Oliszcak, DuWayne Wacker, Terry Wanless  
 North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, Robert Entzion, Allan G. Fischer, Thomas R. Plough  
 North Florida, University of: Richard Gropper, Adam W. Herbert, Kathleen Klein  
 North Park College: Jerry Chaplin  
 North Texas, University of: Blaine Brownell, Timothy M. Fitzpatrick, Craig Helwig, Alfred F. Hurley, John Thornton  
 Northeast Louisiana University: Karen Allen, Walter Creekmore, Richard C. Giannini, Diane Stark, Lawson L. Swearingen Jr.  
 Northeast Missouri State University: Mary Sue Beersman, Walter H. Ryle, Kathy J. Turpin  
 Northeastern Illinois University: Barbara Bales, Vivian L. Fuller, Lynn Gaziano  
 Northeastern University: Terry Condon, Barry Gallup, Erik L. Nedeau, Tracy Shoemake, David C. Wharton  
 Northern Arizona University: Steven P. Holton, Clara M. Lovett, Sam F. McClanahan, Kelly Patton-Woodward  
 Northern Colorado, University of: James Fallis, Robert L. Heiny, Herman D. Lujan, Denise O'Grady  
 Northern Illinois University: Diane Abrahamson, Robert J. Brigham, Raymond Dembinski, Cary Groth, John E. La Tourette  
 Northern Iowa, University of: Robert D. Koob, Christopher Ritrievi, Jack D. Wilkinson, Sandra C. Williamson  
 Northern Kentucky University: Leon E. Boothe, Thomas J. Kearns, Jane Meier, Norleen K. Pomerantz  
 Northern Michigan University: Anne G. James, James Suksi  
 Northern State University: Donald W. Erlenbusch, Patricia A. Fors, James Kretchman, Peggy Voisin  
 Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, Dean L. Hubbard, James C. Redd, Sherri Reeves  
 Northwestern State University: Robert A. Alost, Tynes Hildebrand, Jerry Pierce  
 Northwestern University: Frederick Hemke, Betsy J. Mosher, Kelly Portolese, Charles F. "Rick" Taylor  
 Northwood University: David W. Coffey, Anthony A. Mariano  
 Norwich University: Ernest D. True  
 Notre Dame, College of (Maryland): Donna M. Ledwin  
 Notre Dame, University of: Rev. E. William Beauchamp, Melissa L. Conboy, Lawrence Cunningham, Thomas Kelly, Michael A. Wadsworth

Oakland University: Tracy Huth, William Macauley, Jack Mehl  
 Oberlin College: George Andrews, Michael R. Heithaus  
 Occidental College: Linda F. Lyke  
 Oglethorpe University: Robert Unger  
 Ohio Northern University: Gale E. Daugherty, Gayle Lauth  
 Ohio State University: E. Gordon Gee, Ferdinand A. Geiger, Archie Griffin, Susan M. Hartmann, Lawrence M. Romanoff, Michelle O. Willis



Ohio University: Thomas Boeh, Robert Glidden, Andy Kreutzer, Peggy J. Pruitt, Jessie C. Roberson Jr.  
 Oklahoma, University of: Donnie Duncan, Daniel G. Gibbens, Marita Hynes, Larry Naifeh  
 Oklahoma State University: Ann Baer, James E. Halligan, Gerald M. Lage, Terry Don Phillips  
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, Janis Sanchez-Hucles  
 Olivet College: Mark Bollman, Dick Kaiser  
 Oneonta, State University College at: Tracey Ranieri  
 Oral Roberts University: Mike Carter, Richard L. Roberts, Terry Unruh  
 Oregon, University of: Gary Gray, William Moos, James M. O'Fallon, Barbara Walker  
 Oregon State University: Dutch Baughman, Michael Beachley, Robert J. Frank, Paul G. Risser, Robyn Sharp  
 Oswego, State University College at: Sandra L. Moore  
 Otterbein College: Marilyn E. Day, Richard Fishbaugh  
  
 Pace University: Christopher Bledsoe, Philomena Mantella  
 Pacific (California), University of the: Donald W. Bryan, Bob Lee, Cynthia Spiro  
 Paine College: Ricardo Bravo, Ronnie O. Spry  
 Pembroke State University: Brenda Burgess, Susan Edkins, Ray Pennington  
 Pennsylvania, University of: D. Elton Cochran-Fikes, Carolyn Schlie Femovich  
 Pennsylvania State University: John Bove, John J. Coyle, Ellen L. Perry, Graham Spanier  
 Pennsylvania State University-Behrend College: Herbert J. Lauffer, John M. Lilley  
 Pepperdine University: Roxanne K. Levenson, Wayne Wright  
 Pfeiffer College: T. J. Kostecky  
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Thomas R. Shirley Jr.  
 Pittsburg State University: John Darling, George Graham, Shannon O'Shea-Schmieg, William O. Samuels  
 Pittsburgh, University of: Ronald Brown, Jerry Cochran, Richard A. Holmes, L. Oval Jaynes, Kenneth F. Metz, Donna Sanft, Carol J. Sprague  
 Plattsburgh, State University of New York at: Peter Luguri  
 Plymouth State College: Stephen R. Bamford, Richard Hage, Donald P. Wharton  
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Curtis W. Tong  
 Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel, Rev. David T. Tyson  
 Portland State University: Robert Lockwood, Judith A. Ramaley, Jim Sterk  
 Potsdam, State University College at: William Donohue, David A. Smith  
 Prairie View A&M University: Angela McMorris, Jewel L. Prestage, Hensley W. Sapenter, Hoover J. Wright  
 Presbyterian College: George M. Dupuy, J. Allen Morris

Princeton University: Amy Campbell, George H. VanderZwaag, Gary D. Walters  
 Principia College: Seth C. Johnson  
 Providence College: Terence J. Keegan, John M. Marinatto, Patricia D. Nicol  
 Purdue University: Steven C. Beering, Morgan J. Burke, Martha O. Chiscon, Joni Comstock, Philip E. Nelson  
  
 Queens College (New York): Evangelos Gizis, Allen Lee Sessoms, Richard Wettan  
 Quincy University: James Naumovich, Rev. James Toal  
 Quinnipiac College: John Lahey, Jack McDonald, Linda J. Wooster  
  
 Ramapo College: Kay Catherine Collins  
 Randolph-Macon College: Ted Keller, Helmut Werner  
 Redlands, University of: James R. Appleton, Carl R. Clapp  
 Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith W. Burling  
 Regis University (Colorado): Tom Dedin, Barbara J. Schroeder  
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte, Kerry Quinn  
 Rhode Island, University of: Lauren E. Anderson, Robert L. Carothers, Donald E. McCreight, Ronald J. Petro  
 Rhode Island College: Donald E. Tencher  
 Rhodes College: Mike Clary, David L. Harlow, Robert Shankman  
 Rice University: James A. Castaneda, Alan J. Chapman, Martha E. Hawthorne, John R. May, Steven Moniaci  
 Richard Stockton College of New Jersey: G. Larry James  
 Richmond, University of: Harold W. Babb, Charles S. Boone, Ruth Goehring  
 Rider University: Curtis W. Blake, Chet Dalgewicz, J. Barton Luedeke, Nancy L. Roberts  
 Roanoke College: M. Scott Allison  
 Robert Morris College: Frank H. Burdine, Bruce A. Corrie, Susan Hofacre, Edward A. Nicholson, Robert W. Norberg  
 Rochester, University of: Rich Magere, Jeffrey Vennell, Joyce Wong  
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Louis W. Spiotti  
 Rockford College: William F. Langston  
 Roger Williams College: William M. Baird, Anthony J. Santoro  
 Rollins College: Dan O'Callaghan, J. Philip Roach  
 Rowan College of New Jersey: Joyce Reighn, Edward Streb  
 Russell Sage College: Raymond C. Nause  
 Rust College: David L. Beckley  
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Rita Kay Thomas  
 Rutgers University, Newark: John K. Adams, Florence A. Labenski  
  
 Sacred Heart University: C. Donald Cook, Elizabeth Luckie, Dan A. Pannese  
 Saginaw Valley State University: Robert T. Becker, George W. Eastland Jr.  
 St. Andrews Presbyterian College: Ruth Holden  
 St. Anselm College: Theodore S. Paulauskas



St. Augustine's College: Wanzo F. Hendrix  
 St. Benedict, College of: Carol Howe-Veenstra, Lu Ann Reif  
 St. Bonaventure University: David Diles, Barbara Hick  
 St. Cloud State University: Arthur F. Grachek, Bruce F. Grube, Mike Simpson, David Sprague  
 St. Francis, College of (Illinois): Richard Luenemann  
 St. Francis College (New York): James G. Thompson  
 St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Bruce Elwell, Wendy Guthrie, Frank Pergolizzi  
 St. John Fisher College: Michele Morano  
 St. John's University (Minnesota): Kenneth M. Jones  
 St. John's University (New York): Richard J. Krempecki, Edward J. Manetta Jr., Kathleen Meehan  
 St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Fred Berger, Linda Deno, Albert J. Shannon  
 St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania): Don J. DiJulia, Stephen Porth, Rev. Nicholas S. Rashford  
 St. Lawrence University: Thomas E. Bambrey, John A. Clark, Dorothy L. Hall  
 St. Leo College: Ted Owens  
 St. Louis University: Lori A. Flanagan, Michael J. Ross, Doug Woolard  
 St. Mary's College (California): Rosalyn Dunlap-Alli, Sue Fallis, Richard Mazzuto  
 St. Mary's College (Indiana): Jan Travis  
 St. Mary's College (Minnesota): Linda Anderson  
 St. Mary's College of Maryland: Paul R. Moyer  
 St. Michael's College: Edward P. Markey  
 St. Norbert College: Larry Van Alstine  
 St. Olaf College: Gary Wicks  
 St. Paul's College: Sunday A. Adesuyi, David W. Johnson  
 St. Peter's College: Kim E. Culligan, Rev. James N. Loughran, Edward Reuter, William A. Stein  
 St. Rose, College of: Catherine C. Haker, Louis C. Vaccaro  
 St. Scholastica, College of: Kevin C. Snyder  
 St. Thomas, University of (Minnesota): Jo Ann Andregg  
 Salem State College: John D. Galaris  
 Salem-Teikyo University: Ronald E. Ohl, Lou Talerico  
 Salisbury State University: Michael P. Vienna  
 Salve Regina University: John J. Rok, Lynn Sheedy  
 Sam Houston State University: Ronnie Choate, Tom Davis, Bobby K. Marks  
 Samford University: Stephen C. Allgood, Thomas E. Corts  
 San Diego, University of: Thomas Innacone, Regina Sullivan  
 San Diego State University: Richard M. Bay, Reginald Blaylock, Jana Doggett, Ernst Griffin  
 San Francisco, University of: Sandee L. Hill, William J. Hogan  
 San Francisco State University: Betsy Alden, Patricia Bartscher, Robert A. Corrigan, Randi Lydum  
 San Jose State University: Thomas M. Brennan, Daniel Buerger, Robert L. Caret, Carolyn M. Lewis, Charles Whitcomb  
 Santa Clara University: Amy E. Hackett, Lynda Tealer, Carroll M.

Williams  
 Savannah College of Art and Design: Matthew T. Newman  
 Savannah State College: Frank Ellis Jr., Shirley S. Paremore  
 Scranton, University of: Gary N. Wodder  
 Seattle Pacific University: Alan R. Graham  
 Seton Hall University: George P. Browne, Laurence C. Keating Jr., Sue Regan, Laura A. Wankel  
 Shaw University: Dianthia M. Ford, Thomas E. Kee, Ernest L. Pickens  
 Shepherd College: Barbara E. Beard  
 Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: Anthony F. Ceddia, Jane Goss, George F. Harpster, C. William Knerr, James G. Pribula  
 Siena College: Timothy Burke, John D'Argenio, Father John Frambes, Joyce A. Legere  
 Simpson College: Fred O. Jones  
 Skidmore College: Tim Brown  
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Robertha Abney, Robert N. Aebersold, Bob Heller, Paul A. Lueken  
 Smith College: Carla M. Coffey, Lynn Oberbillig  
 Sonoma State University: Ralph Barkey  
 South, University of: Nancy Ladd, Robert W. Pearigen, Mark Webb  
 South Alabama, University of: Joe Gottfried, George Smith, Samuel J. Strada, Hal Williams, Pam Young  
 South Carolina, University of, at Aiken: Robert E. Alexander, Douglas R. Warrick  
 South Carolina, University of, Columbia: Laurie Massa, Michael B. McGee, John M. Palms, Susie H. VanHuss  
 South Carolina, University of, at Spartanburg: H. Michael Hall, John C. Stockwell  
 South Carolina State University: Leroy Davis  
 South Dakota, University of: Betty Turner Asher, Jack F. Doyle, John M. Hilpert, George R. Horner, Mary Mock  
 South Dakota State University: Mylo A. Hellickson, Fred M. Oien, Robert T. Wagner  
 South Florida, University of: Betty Castor, Paul S. Griffin, Pam LaPan, Barbara Sparks-McGlinchy, Curtis W. Wienker  
 Southampton Campus of Long Island University: Mary E. Topping  
 Southeast Missouri State University: Bill L. Atchley, Joseph H. Low Jr., Richard A. McDuffie, Lana Richmond, Alicia Scott  
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Billy Bond, Sally Clausen, Tom Douple  
 Southern California, University of: Michael Garrett, Daryl Gross, Lisa Love, Noel Ragsdale, Steven B. Sample, Fred Stroock  
 Southern Colorado, University of: Patrick Bottini, Dan DeRose, Robert C. Shirley, Tony Taibi  
 Southern Connecticut State University: Antonio Aceto, Michael J. Adanti, Lawrence E. Fitzgerald, Nancy H. Lyons, Darryl Rogers  
 Southern Illinois University at Carbondale: John J. Cody, James Hart, Charlotte West  
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Nancy Belck, James Buck, Cynthia Jones, John Meisel



Southern Indiana, University of: Charles J. Bertram, Steve J. Newton  
 Southern Maine, University of: Albert D. Bean, Remo H. Riciputi  
 Southern Methodist University: Thomas E. Barry, W. James Copeland Jr., Charles Howard, C. Paul Rogers III, Barb Totzke, R. Gerald Turner  
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Ralph N. Floyd Jr., Helen Grant, Aubrey K. Lucas, Ronald G. Marquardt, H. C. McLellan  
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Marino H. Casem, Moses K. Dupre, Thonius Robinson Jr.  
 Southern Utah University: Kathryn Berg, Jack Bishop, David R. Braegger, Michael Richards  
 Southwest Baptist University: Rex B. Brown, Stephanie Miller, Rod Oglesby  
 Southwest Missouri State University: Linda Dollar, Larry L. George, John H. Keiser, Bill O'Neill, Gregory P. Onstot, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn  
 Southwest State University: Gary A. Carney  
 Southwest Texas State University: Michael Abbott, Dana L. Craft, Katy Devlin, Richard Hannan, Jerome H. Supple  
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: J. Wayne Andrepont, Ray P. Authement, Curtis L. Hollinger Jr., Sherry LeBas, Nelson J. Schexnayder Jr.  
 Southwestern University (Texas): Sherri Babcock, Halford Haskell, Jim Mallon, Glada C. Munt, Roy B. Shilling Jr.  
 Springfield College: Edward Bilik, Scott Nichols  
 Stanford University: Susan Simoni Burk, Edward Leland, Cheryl L. Levick, Jerry I. Porras  
 Staten Island, College of: Carol Jackson, Terry Small  
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Dan Angel, Matthew Fenley, Darren Fort, Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo  
 Stetson University: Jeff Altier, Robert J. Jacoby, Elizabeth J. Schumaker  
 Stevens Institute of Technology: Frank J. Rotunda  
 Stony Brook, State University of New York at: Paul J. Dudzick, Richard F. Laskowski, Sandra R. Weeden  
 Suffolk University: James E. Nelson  
 Susquehanna University: Connie Harnum, Donald Harnum  
 Swarthmore College: Susan P. Davis, Robert E. Williams  
 Syracuse University: John J. Crouthamel, John P. Hardt, Janet Kittell, Kenneth A. Shaw

Tampa, University of: Hindman Wall  
 Tarleton State University: Lamar Johanson, Jim Johnson, Dennis McCabe  
 Temple University: JoAnne A. Epps, R. C. Johnson, Barbara Kilgour  
 Tennessee, University of, at Chattanooga: Edward G. Farrell, Michael H. Jones, Frederick W. Obear, Lisa M. Rhodes  
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Carl W. Asp, Joan C. Cronan, Joseph E. Johnson, Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., William T. Snyder, Donna C. Thomas, Marianne Woodside  
 Tennessee, University of, at Martin: Ernest W. Blythe Jr., Benny Hol-

lis, Milly MacDonell, Margaret N. Perry  
 Tennessee State University: Howard C. Gentry Jr., Thomas J. Martin  
 Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, Marcia Borys, David L. Larimore  
 Texas, University of, at Arlington: Cathy Beene, Peter D. Carlon, Bill Reeves, Bill Ross  
 Texas, University of, at Austin: Robert M. Berdahl, Jody Conradt, DeLoss Dodds, Ed Sharpe, Waneen Spirduso, Leroy Sutherland, James W. Vick  
 Texas, University of, at El Paso: Maxine V. Neill-Johnson, John K. Thompson, Robert D. Tollen  
 Texas, University of, Pan American: Gary Gallup, Miguel A. Nevarez, Linda O'Daniel  
 Texas, University of, at San Antonio: Ernest DeWinne, Michelle Perry, Bobby Thompson  
 Texas A&M University: Thomas W. Adair III, David Batson, Ray M. Bowen, Tedi Ellison, Wally Groff, Lynn Hickey, Karl Mooney  
 Texas A&M University-Kingsville: Darvin R. Hoffman, Manuel L. Ibanez, Clarice A. Williams  
 Texas Christian University: Carolyn J. Dixon, Joseph W. Helmick, Mel Thomas, William E. Tucker  
 Texas Southern University: Gita Bolt, James M. Douglas, Rick Holden, Sue Leffal, Carol Hightower Parker  
 Texas Tech University: Robert Bockrath, Robert W. Lawless, Taylor McNeel, Gerald Myers, Robert M. Sweazy  
 Texas Woman's University: Judy Southard, Chalese Stachowiak, Carol Surles, G. Ann Uhler, Frank Vitro  
 Thiel College: John Dickason  
 Toledo, University of: Allen R. Bohl, Frank E. Horton, Calvin Lawshe, Tim Selgo, Marnie W. Swift  
 Towson State University: Wayne Edwards, Nance Reed  
 Trenton State College: Kevin A. McHugh  
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Evan S. Dobelle, Gerald J. Hansen, Richard J. Hazelton, Robin L. Sheppard  
 Trinity University (Texas): Julie Jenkins, Robert C. King  
 Troy State University: Fred B. Davis, Doug Hawkins, Jack Hawkins Jr., Douglas C. Patterson  
 Tufts University: Rocco J. Carzo, John A. Di Biaggio  
 Tulane University: Anne S. Barbour, Eamon M. Kelly, Gary R. Roberts, Kevin M. White  
 Tulsa, University of: Robert H. Donaldson, Barry A. Kinsey, Judy MacLeod  
 Tuskegee University: H. Frank Leftwich Jr.

U.S. Air Force Academy: Denise Cohen, Col. Hans J. Muen, Col. Kenneth L. Schweitzer, Col. Randall W. Spetman  
 U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Raymond Cieplik  
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Susan Petersen Lubow  
 U.S. Military Academy: Lt. Gen. Howard B. Graves, Col. Daniel M. Litynski, Albert Vanderbush  
 U.S. Naval Academy: Jack Lengyel, Richard D. Mathieu, Steve Orsini



Union College (New York): Richard S. Sakala  
 Upper Iowa University: Mike McCready  
 Ursinus College: William E. Akin, Adele P. Boyd, Robert R. Davidson  
 Utah, University of: Larry R. Gerlach, Christopher P. Hill, Arthur K. Smith  
 Utah State University: Chuck Bell, Mary Ellen Cloninger, George H. Emert, Michael Parent  
  
 Valdosta State University: Hugh C. Bailey, Masa Oreskovic, Herb F. Reinhard, Charles R. Tucker  
 Valparaiso University: Bruce G. Berner, Alan F. Harre, William L. Steinbrecher  
 Vanderbilt University: Thomas G. Burish, Tami J. Fisher, June Stewart, Joe B. Wyatt  
 Vassar College: Valerie Cushman, Andrew M. Jennings  
 Vermont, University of: Dean M. Batt, Richard A. Farnham, Sally Guerette, Thomas P. Salmon, Jeff Schulman, Anne M. Sullivan  
 Villanova University: Gene DeFilippo, Mary Anne Dowling, Daniel T. Regan  
 Virginia, University of: M. Terry Holland, Craig Littlepage, Jane Miller, Lynn M. Mitchell, D. Alan Williams  
 Virginia Commonwealth University: Jeff Cupps, Richard L. Sander  
 Virginia Military Institute: Davis Babb, Col. Thomas W. Davis, Joseph C. Smith  
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Jeff Bourne, David T. Braine, Stephen J. Horton, Larry N. Killough, Sharon L. McCloskey  
 Virginia State University: Claud Flythe, Alfreeda Goff  
 Virginia Union University: James F. Battle, Jacqueline McWilliams  
  
 Wabash College: Joseph O'Rourke, Max E. Servies  
 Wagner College: Walter C. Hameline, Bill Smith  
 Wake Forest University: Thomas K. Hearn Jr., M. Maureen Lantz, Ron Wellman, Edwin G. Wilson  
 Wartburg College: Darold M. Wolff  
 Washburn University of Topeka: Larry D. Blumberg, Janet M. Deggin-ger  
 Washington, University of: Robert H. Aronson, Ralph Bayard, Barbara A. Hedges, Richard L. McCormick, Marie T. Tuite  
 Washington and Jefferson College: John J. Gregor, John L. Luckhardt  
 Washington and Lee University: Cinda L. Rankin, George W. Ray II, Michael F. Walsh  
 Washington College (Maryland): Penny J. Fall, Bryan Matthews  
 Washington State University: Rick Dickson, Dan Peterson, Marcia L. Saneholtz, Sally Savage, Samuel H. Smith, Irving Tallman  
 Washington University (Missouri): Justin Carroll, Philip Godfrey, Lynn S. Imergoot, John M. Schael  
 Wayne State College (Nebraska): Peter Chapman  
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Bob V. Brennan, John D. Petersen, Christ Petrouleas  
 Weber State University: Michael Norman, Steven Rackley, Paul H.

Thompson  
 Webster University: Thomas Hart  
 Wellesley College: Louise O'Neal, Suzanne Walmsley  
 Wells College: Lyn LaBar  
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad  
 Wesley College: Steve D. Clark  
 Wesleyan University (Connecticut): John S. Biddiscombe  
 West Alabama, University of: Donald C. Hines, Dee Outlaw, Louis R. Smith Jr.  
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Deborah Anekstein, Edward Matejkovic, Paul M. Oliaro  
 West Florida, University of: Richard Berg, Kenneth Curtis  
 West Georgia College: J. Blake Lanier  
 West Liberty State College: David C. Brooks, James W. Watson  
 West Texas A&M University: Ed Harris, Russell C. Long, Hellon K. Wilbur  
 West Virginia Institute of Technology: Terry A. Rupert  
 West Virginia University: Forest J. Bowman, Roger C. Jeffries, Ed Pastilong, Jon A. Reed  
 West Virginia Wesleyan College: George A. Klebez  
 Western Carolina University: Scott Higgins, Betty J. Peele, Larry L. Travis  
 Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington, James R. Roach  
 Western Illinois University: William E. Johnson, Larry Mortier, Kathy Orban, Helen Smiley  
 Western Kentucky University: Pam Herriford, Thomas C. Meredith, Lewis Mills, Steven D. White  
 Western Maryland College: J. Richard Carpenter Jr., Carol A. Fritz  
 Western Michigan University: Kathy B. Beauregard, Gregory A. Dobson, Adrian Edwards, Diether Haenicke, Andre Wallace, James C. Weaver  
 Western State College of Colorado: Leila M. Calkins, Donald L. Porter, Greg Waggoner  
 Westfield State College: Ronald L. Applbaum, Kenneth Magarian  
 Westminster College (Missouri): Terry Logue  
 Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd  
 Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Chad Yowell  
 Wheeling Jesuit College: C. James Goodwin  
 Whittier College: David A. Jacobs  
 Wichita State University: Darlene Bailey, Bill Belknap, Eugene M. Hughes, Martin M. Perline  
 Widener University: John E. Douglas  
 Wilkes University: Christopher N. Breiseth, Addy Malatesta  
 William and Mary, College of: Barbara Blosser, John W. Conlee  
 William Paterson College: Arthur Eason, Sabrina Grant  
 William Penn College: Michael Laird  
 Williams College: Robert R. Peck  
 Wilmington College (Ohio): Don Tecklenburg  
 Wingate University: Beth Lawrence, Jerry E. McGee  
 Winona State University: Sandra Benning, James W. Bovinet,



Stephen Juaire, Darrel W. Krueger  
 Winston-Salem State University: Robin B. Ervin, Arnold Lockett,  
 William J. Rice, Albert L. Roseboro  
 Winthrop University: Thomas N. Hickman, Steve Vacendak  
 Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire: Carol L. Klun, Marilyn  
 Skrivseth  
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Dennis Otis Chambers, Charles  
 A. Ihrke, Mark L. Perkins  
 Wisconsin, University of, La Crosse: Bridget Belgiovine, Jearold Hol-  
 land  
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: Anthony Adams, James L. Hoyt,  
 Cheryl A. Marra, Joel Maturi, Pat Richter, David Ward  
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Doug Beard, Rita Hartung  
 Cheng, Deanna D'Abbraccio, Bud K. Haidet, John H. Schroeder  
 Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Allen F. Ackerman, John Kerrigan,  
 Carl B. Tower  
 Wisconsin, University of, Parkside: Linda Draft, William J. Murin,  
 Eleanor J. Smith  
 Wisconsin, University of, River Falls: Connie Foster, Elizabeth J. Oost-  
 endorp  
 Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Frank O'Brien, Nancy Page  
 Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Steven P. Terry, John Wesolek  
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Dianne Jones  
 Wittenberg University: Jeff A. Ankrom, Karen Fellows, Carl F.  
 Schraibman, Baird Tipson  
 Wofford College: Thad Lepcio, Joab M. Lesesne Jr., Terri Lewitt, Ted  
 R. Monroe, Daniel B. Morrison Jr.  
 Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, William D. McHenry, Brenda  
 Meese  
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Raymond R. Gilbert  
 Worcester State College: Susan E. Chapman  
 Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Harley E. Flack, Charles  
 J. Hartmann, Peggy L. Wynkoop  
 Wyoming, University of: David Baker, Robert S. Cochran, Terri Howes,  
 Dan Viola  
 Xavier University (Ohio): Jeffrey H. Fogelson, Ginger Fulton, Janice  
 B. Walker  
 Yale University: Thomas A. Beckett, Barbara N. Chesler, Colleen Lim  
 Yeshiva University: Stephen B. Young  
 York College (New York): Stuart Bailin  
 Youngstown State University: Frederick J. Blue, Leslie H. Cochran,  
 Floyd Kerr, James W. Morrison, Pauline N. Saternow, James P.  
 Tressel

### Conference Members

\*American West Conference: Victor A. Buccola  
 Atlantic Coast Conference: Rick Chryst, Eugene F. Corrigan, Thomas  
 P. Mickle, David V. Thompson, DeLores S. Todd

Atlantic 10 Conference: Linda M. Bruno, Cindy Mazda  
 Big East Conference: Tom McElroy, Michael A. Tranghese, Stan  
 Wilcox  
 Big Eight Conference: Tim Allen, Lori A. Ebihara, Prentice Gautt,  
 Dru Hancock, Carl C. James  
 Big Sky Conference: Douglas B. Fullerton, Kathy Noble  
 Big South Conference: Carl McAloose, George F. Sasser, Wendy Taylor  
 Big Ten Conference: James E. Delany, Phyllis L. Howlett, Carol Iwao-  
 ka  
 Big West Conference: Dennis A. Farrell, Rob Halvaks, Jody  
 McRoberts, Paula Y. Smith  
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Tom D. Morgan  
 Capital Athletic Conference: Richard C. Cook  
 Carolinas-Virginia Athletic Conference: Alan H. Patterson  
 Centennial Conference: Steven F. Ulrich  
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Patrick Carter, Leon G.  
 Kerry, Martha Marcolini  
 City University of New York Athletic Conference: Ted Hurwitz  
 College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin: Jack Swartz  
 \*Collegiate Water Polo Association: Daniel Sharadin  
 Colonial Athletic Association: Kathleen Hallock, Thomas E. Yeager  
 Colorado Athletic Conference: Richard A. Wolf  
 Commonwealth Coast Conference: Mary Ellen Alger  
 Conference USA: Kendyl Baugh, Sandra Biller, Jim Campbell, Rex  
 Lardner, Michael L. Slive, Brenda R. Weare  
 Constitution Athletic Conference: Richard A. Hill  
 Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Michael J. Welch  
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Clayton W. Chapman, Dan  
 Ghormley  
 \*Gateway Football Conference: Patricia Viverito  
 Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Thomas J. Brown  
 Great Lakes Valley Conference: Kenneth A. Lindsey  
 Great Northeast Athletic Conference: Phil A. Rowe  
 Gulf South Conference: Nathan N. Salant  
 Indiana Collegiate Athletic Conference: Ralph B. McBride  
 Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: John Van Why  
 Ivy Group: Carolyn Campbell, Jeffrey H. Orleans  
 Little East Conference: Albert D. Bean Jr.  
 Lone Star Conference: Bob Jacoby, Fred Jacoby  
 Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: John D. Galaris  
 Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Barbara Church, Richard J.  
 Ensor, Karin Torchia  
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Sheila K. Wallace Ko-  
 valchik  
 Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Ken B. Jones  
 Mid-American Conference: Rob Fournier, Kelly Groddy, Jerry A. Ip-  
 politi  
 Mid-Continent Conference: Cindy Harris, Jon A. Steinbrecher  
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Larry Barber, Kenneth A. Free,  
 Brenda H. McCoy  
 Middle Atlantic States Conference: Linda E. Hopple



Midwest Conference: Ruth E. Peterson, Ralph L. Shively  
 Midwestern Collegiate Conference: Amy Frankenstein, Jonathan B. LeCrone  
 Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Carlyle Carter  
 Missouri Valley Conference: J. Douglas Elgin  
 New England Collegiate Conference: William M. Moore  
 New England Women's Eight: Louise O'Neal  
 New Jersey Athletic Conference: Joy L. Reighn  
 New York Collegiate Athletic Conference: Thomas Gallagher  
 New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association: Kristen Ford  
 North Atlantic Conference: Stuart P. Haskell Jr.  
 North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Melanie Heitman Nelson, Noel W. Olson  
 North Coast Athletic Conference: Dennis Butler, Dennis M. Collins  
 Northeast Conference: J. Stevens Hurlbut, Chris Monasch  
 Northeast-10 Conference: F. Paul Bogan  
 Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen  
 Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference: Thomas Wistrick  
 Ohio Athletic Conference: Timothy W. Gleason  
 Ohio Valley Conference: R. Daniel Beebe, Ronald J. English  
 Old Dominion Athletic Conference: Brad Bankston, Daniel E. Wooldridge  
 Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, Christine W. Hoyles, Mike Matthews, David Price  
 Pacific West Conference: Elwood B. Hahn  
 Patriot League: Constance H. Hurlbut, Tim Parker  
 Peach Belt Athletic Conference: Marvin Vanover  
 Pennsylvania Athletic Conference: Michael W. Mould  
 Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Charles A. Eberle  
 Presidents' Athletic Conference: Wallace B. Neel  
 Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference: Kurt L. Patberg  
 Saint Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Terry Logue  
 Skyline Conference: James Catalano  
 South Atlantic Conference: Doug Echols  
 Southeastern Conference: Damon Evans, Roy Kramer, James L. McCullough, Marie Robbins, Patricia W. Wall, Mark Womack  
 Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Rick Simon  
 Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference: Stephen P. Argo  
 Southern Conference: Kathleen Hickey, Wright Waters  
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Wallace Jackson  
 Southland Conference: Britton B. Banowsky, Paul Bradshaw, Jan Redmond, Gregory Sankey  
 Southwest Conference: Coley Chambless, Rick Dunn, Bill Foster, Kyle Kallander  
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: James Frank, LaRita Greer, Dell Robinson  
 State University of New York Athletic Conference: Patrick R. Damore  
 Sun Belt Conference: Robert J. Bernardi, John Iamarino, Craig Thompson  
 Sunshine State Conference: Don Landry

Trans America Athletic Conference: William C. Bibb, Edward Gumbart, Stephen E. Sturek Jr.  
 University Athletic Association: Richard A. Rasmussen  
 West Coast Conference: Michael M. Gilleran, Teresa Kuehn, Don Ott  
 West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Barry Blizzard  
 Western Athletic Conference: Karl D. Benson, Margie McDonald, Dee Anne Menzies  
 \*Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Bruce M. McLeod  
 Wisconsin State University Conference: Dennis Keihn  
 Wisconsin Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Judith Kruckman  
 \*Nonvoting

## Provisional Members

Anderson College (South Carolina): Bobby Beville, Ellen King, Steve Lytton  
 Arkansas, University of, Monticello: Mary Jane Gilbert, Lawrence Smithmier, Fred J. Taylor, W. Kent Webb  
 Arkansas, University of, Pine Bluff: H. O. Clemmons, Lawrence A. Davis Jr., U. S. Grant, Parnell M. McCray  
 Arkansas Tech University: Dean Lee  
 Austin College: Robert T. Mason, Tim Millerick, Oscar C. Page  
 Brigham Young University, Hawaii: E. LeRoy Overstreet, A. Ken Wagner  
 Brooklyn College: Vivian Acosta, Bruce Filosa  
 Cardinal Stritch College: John Pfaffl  
 Cazenovia College: Marvin Christopher  
 Centenary College (New Jersey): Stephanie Bennett-Smith, Patrick J. Zipfel  
 Central Washington University: Gary C. Frederick, Ivory V. Nelson, Sarah E. Shumate  
 Chatham College: Noreen O'Malley  
 Chowan College: James G. Garrison, Becky McLawhorn  
 Christian Brothers University: Bro. Michael McGinniss, Bob Stephenson  
 Clarke College: E. James Petty  
 Clayton State College: Mason Barfield, Richard A. Skinner  
 Concordia University at Austin: William Driskill  
 Concordia University (Wisconsin): Rev. R. John Buuck  
 Dallas, University of: Paul Carney, Donald J. Miller, Richard L. Strockbine  
 East Central University: Pamla Armstrong, Bill S. Cole, Marc Evans, Tim Green, Troy Ray Hamlett, Cheryl Lyons  
 East Texas Baptist University: Gary K. Cain  
 Eastern Oregon State College: Peggy Anderson  
 Evergreen State College: Jan Smisek, Pete Steilberg  
 George Fox College: Edward F. Stevens, Craig Taylor  
 Georgia Southwestern College: Steve R. Cobb, Liz Wilson  
 Greenville College: Jack D. Trager  
 Harding University: David B. Burks, Wilton Martin, Harry Olree



Hawaii Pacific University: Barbara Burke  
 Hilbert College: Brian Ackley  
 Holy Family College: George O'Brien  
 Houston Baptist University: Robert H. Dvorak  
 Incarnate Word College: Howard Patterson  
 Johnson and Wales University: Ronald J. Bachman  
 La Roche College: Lynn Tubman  
 Lake Erie College: Robert C. Benz  
 Langston University: Shelby Lauener  
 Lassell College: Kristy Walter  
 Lesley College: Paul O'Gilvie  
 Lewis and Clark College: Greg Fredricks, Steve Wallo  
 Lewis-Clark State College: Janet Danley, Daniel Mayton, Kate Peterson, Gary Picone, Kip Yoshimura  
 Linfield College: Scott Carnahan, John Reed  
 Lyon College: Terry J. Garner, Rodney K. Stroud  
 Maine, University of, Farmington: Leonard R. MacPhee  
 Maranatha Baptist Bible College: Greg Weniger  
 Marian College (Wisconsin): Brian Gillogly  
 Mary Hardin-Baylor, University of: Ben Shipp  
 Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences: Donna M. Ruseckas  
 McMurry University: A. C. Sharp, Robert E. Shimp  
 Midwestern State University: Stephen A. Holland, Louis J. Rodriguez  
 Montevallo, University of: Judy Green, Robert M. McChesney  
 Mount Mary College: John Lockman  
 Mount St. Joseph, College of: Jeff Long, Steven Radcliffe  
 New England, University of: Karol L'Heureux, John P. Tumiel  
 Northeastern State University: Gil Cloud, Roger Webb  
 Northwestern Oklahoma State University: Randy Smith  
 Oklahoma Panhandle State University: Kathleen Turner  
 Oklahoma, University of Science and Arts of: Ray A. Merchant  
 Ouachita Baptist University: Billy C. Vining  
 Ozarks, University of the (Arkansas): Buddy Lee Smith, Gene Stephenson  
 Pacific Lutheran University: Jerrold E. Lerum  
 Pacific University (Oregon): Judy Sherman  
 Pittsburgh, University of, at Bradford: Dennis A. Booher  
 Puerto Rico, University of, Bayamon: Rafael Rosado, Jorge L. Rosario  
 Puerto Rico, University of, Mayaguez: Emma Hocking, Manuel D. Ramirez  
 Puget Sound, University of: William Dasher, Richard Ulrich  
 Rivier College: Joanne Merrill  
 Rockhurst College: Frank Diskin  
 St. Edward's University: John Knorr, Debora Williamson  
 St. Joseph's College (New York): Donald L. Lizak  
 St. Martin's College: Clayton N. Smith  
 St. Mary's University (Texas): Steve Johnson, David Krause, Charlie Migl, Ruth R. Rodgers  
 Schreiner College: Tom Wells  
 Southeastern Oklahoma State University: Vicki L. Hudson, Donald A.

Parham, Jerry Polson, Larry Williams  
 Southern Arkansas University: Steven G. Gamble, W. T. Watson  
 Southern Oregon State College: Monty Cartwright  
 Southern Vermont College: Michael J. Burns  
 Southwestern Oklahoma State University: Cecil Perkins  
 Stephens College: Marcia Kierscht  
 Sul Ross State University: R. Vic Morgan  
 Texas Lutheran College: Susan Duke, Ronald Huntsman, Kathryn Yandell  
 Texas Wesleyan University: Rosemarie Stallman, David J. Voskuil  
 Trinity College (District of Columbia): Mary Beth Dwyer  
 Tusculum College: Jim Fields, Dwayne Hatcher  
 Virgin Islands, University of the: Elridge W. Blake, Laura T. Daniel, Ron E. Harrigan, Angel L. Morales  
 West Virginia State College: Steven D. Rader  
 Western Oregon State College: Jon Carey  
 Western Washington University: Lynda Goodrich  
 Westminster College (Pennsylvania): Joseph B. Fusco  
 Wheelock College: Edward J. Matz  
 Whitman College: Craig Gunsul, Max Seachris  
 Whitworth College: Scott McQuilkin, Richard E. Schatz  
 Willamette University: David E. Goodney, Bill Trenbeath  
 Wilson College: Lori A. Frey  
 Wisconsin Lutheran College: Paul F. Knueppel

## Affiliated Members

Amateur Softball Association: Don Porter  
 American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers: Cliff Gillespie  
 American Baseball Coaches Association: David B. Keilitz  
 Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic: Peter H. Lappin, Jake O'Donnell, William C. Sullivan  
 Black Coaches Association: Mark Brand, Alex Wood  
 College Football Association: Kirby Hocutt, Charles M. Neinas  
 College Gymnastics Association: Richard Aronson, Tom Dunn, Roy Johnson, Fred Turoff  
 College Sports Information Directors of America: Fred Nuesch  
 College Swimming Coaches Association of America, Inc.: G. Robert Boettner  
 Community College League of California: Joanne A. Fortunato  
 Division I-A Athletics Directors Association: Gene E. Hooks  
 Golf Coaches Association of America: James H. Cook, John Means  
 Intercollegiate Tennis Association: Kent DeMars, Jeff Frank  
 Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association: John J. Powers  
 National Association for Girls and Women in Sport: Diana Everett  
 National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics: W. Fred Mims  
 National Association of Basketball Coaches: James Haney  
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary, Patrick Manak, Bob Vecchione



National Association of Collegiate Gymnastics Coaches (Women): Meg Stephenson  
 National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators: Jane Betts, Dawn M. Darby  
 National Football Officials Alliance, Inc.: Tommy Taylor  
 National Softball Coaches Association: Lacy Lee Baker  
 National Strength and Conditioning Association: Boyd Epley  
 NCAA Division I Track Coaches Association: Beverly Kearney  
 U.S. Olympic Committee: Patrice Milkovich  
 United States Tennis Association: Richard F. Haitbrink  
 United States Track Coaches Association: Jimmy Carnes, Gary K. Schwartz  
 USA Basketball: Warren S. Brown  
 Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Betty Jaynes

### Corresponding Members

Belmont University: James A. Tillman  
 Nova Southeastern University: Corey B. Johnson  
 Pratt Institute: Eugene Marshall Jr.

### Visitors

American Association of State Colleges and Universities: James B. Appleberry  
 Andrew W. Mellon Foundation: James Shulman  
 Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games: Peter Simmons  
 Big 12 Conference: Steve Hatchell  
 Bond, Schoeneck & King: Kathy Jones  
 Crane, Adam  
 Fair Test: Charles Rooney, Robert A. Schaeffer, Marilyn Yohe  
 Game Day Sports Programming Network: Mike Henry, Clyde Walker  
 Gizzi, Keith  
 Good Sports, Inc.: Valerie M. Bonnette  
 Harsh, Emily H.  
 Hinshaw and Culbertson: Jerome R. Vainisi  
 Husson College: Pam Hennessey  
 Knight Commission on College Athletics: Creed Black, Maureen E. Devlin, Jack Griffin, Louis Harris, Roger Valdiserri  
 Lamar Daniel, Inc.: Lamar Daniel  
 Learfield Communications: Roger Gardner  
 Marriott Corporation: Allison Harke  
 Meadowlands Sports Complex: Michael Graime  
 Mitsubishi Diamond Vision: Mike Curtin  
 National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities: David L. Warren  
 National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges: C. Peter Magrath  
 National Federation of State High School Associations: Helen E. Upton  
 National Rainbow Coalition: Charles S. Farrell  
 NCAA Presidents Commission: Judith E. N. Albino, Asa N. Green

NIKE, Inc.: Ralph Greene, Christopher B. "Kit" Morris  
 Northwest Conference of Independent Colleges: Arleigh Dodson  
 Orange Bowl Committee: Clark Cook, Steve Lynch, Susan Norton  
 Rose Bowl: Bob Cheney, Harriman Cronk, Jack French, Bill Johnstone, Pat Kunz, Don Wilson  
 Taylor University: Wynn A. Lembright  
 USA-Noel Levitz: Glen Korobov  
 Walt Disney World Sports: Mike Millay  
 Watt, Tieder and Hoffar: Douglas Proxmire  
 Women's Basketball Hall of Fame: Phyllis I. Holmes

### Working News Media

ABC: Roddy Dell, Chuck Pharris  
 Associated Press: Jamie Aaron, Eric Gay, Jim Janscha, Kevin O'Hanlon, Doug Tucker, Bill Waugh  
 Atlanta Constitution: J. C. Clemons  
 Austin American-Statesman: Kirk Bohl, Mark Wangrin  
 Baton Rouge Advocate: Dave Moorman  
 Boston Globe: Mark Blaudschun  
 CBS Sports: Len DeLuca, Raymond Harmon, Amanda Weinstein  
 Central College (Iowa): Larry Happel  
 Charlotte Observer: Liz Chandler  
 Chronicle of Higher Education: Debra Blum, Doug Hopfer  
 Cleveland Plain-Dealer: Bonnie DeSimone  
 CNN: Mark Morgan  
 College Football Hall of Fame: Pat Harmon  
 College Sports Magazine: Norb Garrett, David Seigerman  
 Creative Sports: Bray Cary, Pete Derzis, Loren Matthews  
 Dallas Morning News: Doug Bedell, David McNabb, Steve Richardson  
 Des Moines Register: Tim Witosky  
 Detroit Free Press: Steve Kornacki  
 Detroit News: Fred Girard  
 ESPN: Mike Aresco, Dave Brown, Dan Margulis, Shireen Saski, Mike Salter, Mike Sheppard  
 Fort Lauderdale Sun-Sentinel: Randall Mell  
 Fort Worth Star-Telegram: Wendell Barnhouse  
 Hickman Voice-News: Don Bryant  
 Host Communications: W. James Host, Marc Kidd  
 Houston Chronicle: Danny Robbins  
 Kansas City Star: Mike McGraw, Mary Schmitt  
 Los Angeles Times: Elliott Almond, Bill Dwyre, Maryann Hudson  
 Mississippi Sports Columnist: Jimmie McDowell  
 Mobile Register: Tommy Hicks  
 NCAA International: Richard Kazmaier, Robert Ruxin  
 New Orleans Times-Picayune: Bill Campbell  
 New York Times: Malcolm Moran  
 Omaha World-Herald: Tom Shatel  
 Raleigh News & Observer: Chip Alexander  
 Raycom Sports Inc.: Ken Haines, George Johnson, Chuck Steedman, Ben Sutton



Scripps Howard News Service: Thomas O'Toole  
Sports Illustrated: Don Yaeger  
Touchdown Publications: Robert Fulton  
Tucson Citizen: Corky Simpson  
Turner Sports: Bill Irish, John Vandergrift  
USA Today: Steve Wieberg  
Washington Post: Steve Berkowitz

# 90th Annual Convention Opening Business Session

Sunday Afternoon, January 7, 1996

The 90th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 4:50 p.m., with President Eugene F. Corrigan presiding.

## OPENING REMARKS

**President Corrigan:** I am Gene Corrigan and, for better or worse, I will chair the general business sessions throughout the Convention. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the opening session of the 1996 Convention. Our meetings are conducted under the procedures prescribed by Robert's Rules of Order. We are assisted in that regard by our parliamentarian and former NCAA President, known to so many admirers as "Mr. Mootnicity," Alan Chapman of Rice University.

Before beginning our business, the first order of consideration is to adopt the Convention Program. I will now ask for a motion to adopt the printed program of this Convention so we may proceed with our work.

**Frederick Hemke** (Northwestern University): I move we adopt the printed program of this Convention.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

**President Corrigan:** Do we have any motions to reorder?

**Dennis A. Farrell** (Big West Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move the reordering of Proposal Nos. 18 and No. 19.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

**Robert W. Lawless** (Texas Tech University): I move that we consider Proposal No. 23-2 ahead of 23-1.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

**Joseph T. Donahue** (California State University, Stanislaus): On behalf of the Northern California Athletic Conference, we move that Proposal No. 30 be reordered ahead of Proposal No. 29.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

**Judith Albino** (NCAA Presidents Commission): I move that Proposal No. 7-14 be reordered before 7-4. This is a new amendment and it is an amendment that will provide for referring back to the division restructuring task forces for consideration the issue of substitute participation on the new Executive Committee within the restructuring plan. A copy of that amendment will be distributed tomorrow morning.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

**President Corrigan:** Are there any other items for consideration? I need a motion now to adopt the Convention Official Notice as amended.

**Mr. Hemke:** I move that the Convention Notice, as amended, be adopted.



[The motion was seconded and the Convention Program was adopted as reordered.]

**President Corrigan:** The Robert's Rules of Order provide that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of your Convention Official Notice. In addition, you will find in your Official Notice several appendices listing information that may be of assistance to you. The Convention Program contains up-to-date meeting schedules and revisions of the legislation in the Official Notice.

NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and equitable treatment for all members, eliminate any questions of impropriety and expedite your work as delegates. I will not take time to explain all of the parliamentary procedures we use to ensure fairness, but I will remind the delegates that this year, as always, the chairs of the various sessions fully intend to apply these procedures throughout the business of the Convention.

There are certain procedures we employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently. First, in all of the business sessions, the chair will attempt to eyeball as many votes as possible, calling for a count by the Voting Committee only when there is doubt as to the majority. If a delegate intends to debate an issue in any business session, we ask that you be at one of the microphone locations and prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded, or as soon as the previous speaker has concluded his or her remarks. The microphone numbers will be utilized to recognize speakers. If the chair sees no one at a microphone, the vote will be called as quickly as possible. On issues in the general business session on which we vote by division, the chair will call for the vote in the same division sequence each time: Division I first, and then II, and then III. The result of a division's vote will not be announced until all divisions have voted. Please remember that NCAA procedures require all votes to be taken by paddle or roll call, not by voice or a show of hands. You do need to have your voting paddle and your wireless voting unit with you. The electronic voting procedures will be reviewed when the first electronic vote is taken at each of the sessions. The voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions are set forth in NCAA legislation and are summarized in the Official Notice of the Convention. I will not repeat them here. I would ask that you identify yourselves by name and affiliation whenever you address the Convention. Those delegates who wear Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not participate other than as observers. We have a court reporter recording the business of our Convention, Mr. John Bowen, from Kansas City, who is working his 22nd annual Convention. Anyone wishing to withdraw a proposal should notify the staff in the Antique Room in advance of the business sessions, if possible.

I would like to mention a few special features of this year's Convention. This is the fourth year for the Presidential Agenda Day, on which we devote our attention to legislation identified by the Presidents

Commission as representing major policy issues of significant interest to CEOs. You will note that tomorrow, which is designated as Presidential Agenda Day, will open with a general session at 8 a.m., which will allow us to vote on the general provisions of the membership's structure legislation. We then will move to the division business sessions, where we will act on the federated legislation scheduled to be voted on on Presidential Agenda Day. We will end tomorrow's business with a general session, which is scheduled from 4 to 5 p.m. During that session, we will vote on the remaining general legislation scheduled to be voted on during Presidential Agenda Day. Because of the space limitations and the number of registered delegates, we have had to limit access to the general business sessions to the voting and alternate delegates. There will be auxiliary seating with closed circuit television coverage of the general business sessions in the Wedgewood Ballroom. We apologize for any inconvenience. There will be sufficient seating for others registered at the Convention in the division business sessions. Among the other major features of the Convention is the honors dinner tonight. Your attendance is certainly urged for this outstanding annual event. The division business sessions will reconvene Tuesday at 8 a.m. and the general session will resume Tuesday at 1:30 p.m. If we need an additional general session on Wednesday, we have set aside time for that as well.

The NCAA Council determined a few years ago it would be desirable to take a morning and afternoon break during business sessions that are scheduled for the entire morning or afternoon. As those of you who have participated before know, this can be something of a marathon. We may need to take a break and we will do so. Let me also review briefly the "window of reconsideration" opportunity. It is a bit complicated. In the general business sessions, both Monday and Tuesday afternoons, I will call for a motion to reconsider anything adopted by the division business sessions. That will be the only time that a division's business from a separate session can be reconsidered in the general business session. All reconsideration motions involving actions in the division business sessions must occur either in those division sessions or in that window of reconsideration pertaining to those sessions. Please note no proposal identified for action on Presidential Agenda Day can be forwarded to the following day.

#### CONVENTION COMMITTEES

**President Corrigan:** It is now my privilege to introduce the Convention Committees and the chair of each. The Nominating Committee is chaired by Bud Watts of The Citadel. The Men's Committee on Committees is chaired by Todd Turner of North Carolina State University. The Women's Committee on Committees is chaired by Sharon Taylor of Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania. The Voting Committee is chaired by Larry R. Gerlach of the University of Utah. The Committee on Credentials is chaired by Joe Etzel of the University of Portland. The Memorial Resolutions Committee is chaired by Barbara Hick of St. Bonaventure University.

In accordance with our procedures, the reports of sports committees and general committees are not presented at this Convention. They

*Opening Business Session*



are included in the NCAA Annual Reports. You can get a copy of those reports at the registration desk. The report of the secretary-treasurer and the report of the Executive Committee also appear in these Annual Reports. At the beginning of the general business session, we will entertain motions to receive and approve these reports. All official actions taken during the year by the Executive Committee have appeared in The NCAA News.

#### REPORT OF THE COUNCIL

**President Corrigan:** We move now to the NCAA Council Report for 1995. To present that report, I am pleased to present a Council member whose term is ending with this Convention. She is a member of the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, the Committee on Women's Athletics, and the Special Committee to Review Contest Exemptions. She has been a most-valuable contributor to the Council's work. She is Mary Jo Warner, senior associate athletics director at George Washington University. Mary Jo.

**Mary Jo Warner** (George Washington University): President Corrigan and members of the Association, I am honored to present to this Convention the Council report for 1995. This report is mandated by the NCAA constitution. It is thus essentially routine.

This report gives the membership the opportunity to challenge any of the Council's actions during the past year. This presentation is a brief summary. As is customary, this report incorporates by reference the four reports of all Council actions during the year. That reference includes the following: First, The NCAA News publishes the actual minutes of each Council meeting, thus informing you in a timely fashion of all Council actions. In 1995, these minutes appeared in the following issues of The NCAA News: April 26, June 28, November 6 and December 25. Second, the publication titled NCAA Annual Reports contains the abridged minutes of this past year's Council meetings through August. That book is distributed at the Convention and mailed to every NCAA member. In those two publications, you will find every Council action of this past year.

When the last general business begins, there will be a motion to accept and approve the Council's full report. That will be your opportunity to challenge any of these actions. The next procedural aspect to this report is to call to your attention certain legislative actions taken by the Council. We do this by referring to three appendices in the Official Notice. Appendix C sets forth the interpretations that the Legislative Review Committee intends to include in the next printing of the NCAA Manual. All of these inclusions have been approved by the Council. At the beginning of Appendix C is the procedure for accepting or challenging the inclusion of any of these interpretations in the Manual. If you do not want any one of these included in the Manual, now is the time to object. Appendix D contains noncontroversial amendments that the Council adopted during 1995. The Council has the authority to take these noncontroversial actions between Conventions. Acceptance of or a challenge to any of these actions occurs at this point. Does any delegate wish to object to any of the actions in Appendix D? Finally, Appendix E contains instances in which the Council modified word-

ing in the Manual based on a review of the original intent of the legislation. Does any delegate object to any of these actions? That concludes the procedural features of this report.

Among the other issues that the Council considered during the past year were the following: As I am sure you may suspect, most of the Council's time over the past year has been spent reviewing and discussing issues related to the NCAA membership structure and the legislation that will be voted on at this year's Convention in that regard. A report from the Oversight Committee to Review the NCAA Membership Structure was presented either orally or in writing to the Council at each meeting. At a few of those meetings, we were fortunate to have had a presentation from the chair of that committee, Joe Crowley, our esteemed immediate past president.

Each of the division's task forces that have been working on the membership structure made reports to the division steering committees of the Council. It became obvious to me in reading, considering and working through those reports that the individuals involved in this effort spent a great deal of time and effort in coming up with the proposed changes to the membership structure that can work for and be of benefit to the entire membership. We need to applaud their efforts.

The Council also received and acted on the report of the Special Committee to Review Contest Exemptions, chaired by Tom Hansen. This special committee was appointed as a result of action taken at last year's Convention, and recommendations from that special committee are before you at this Convention for action. I want to take this opportunity on behalf of the Council and the membership as a whole to thank Tom and the members of that special committee for their very hard work. Of course, much of the Council's time each year is spent on interpretations, legislation, membership petitions and waivers, various committee reports, and other types of activities necessary for the effective oversight and management of the Association's affairs between Conventions. These matters are reflected in NCAA Annual Reports.

Finally, on a personal note, I would like to say what an honor and privilege it has been for me to serve on the NCAA Council. I appreciate having had the opportunity to work with many fine colleagues on significant issues that affect our student-athletes. The time and energy spent on these issues has been very rewarding.

Mr. Corrigan, that concludes my Council report for 1995. Thank you. (Applause)

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON SPORTSMANSHIP AND ETHICAL CONDUCT IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

**President Corrigan:** Thank you, Mary Jo. You will be missed. We now have a report from the Presidents Commission's Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics. As you recall, sportsmanship and ethical conduct were identified by the Presidents Commission as the theme for this year's Convention. Unfortunately, that topic may have been somewhat overshadowed by all the talk about membership restructuring. Let us not forget how important sportsmanship and ethical conduct are to the world of intercollegiate athletics.

Opening Business Session



Here to present the report of the Presidents Commission's Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct is Bill Shelton, President of Eastern Michigan University and chair of that committee.

**William E. Shelton** (Eastern Michigan University): Thank you, President Corrigan and delegates, on behalf of the Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics, I am pleased to submit our final report to the Association membership.

A printed copy of the report has been made available to each delegate. The contents of that report reflect the activities of the committee during the last 18 months. Sportsmanship and ethical conduct were identified several years ago by the Presidents Commission as the theme of the 1996 Convention. It represents the fourth and last component of the initial strategic plan developed by the Presidents Commission. I recognize another topic is consuming great attention at this gathering. Yet, I would encourage us not to forget the importance of those values so critical to the integrity of our Association.

The Presidents Commission's Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics was charged with studying the evident decline in sportsmanship in intercollegiate athletics in an effort to stem that deterioration, to reaffirm the role of sportsmanship and to revitalize the commitment of fair, ethical behavior in intercollegiate athletics and in life. Throughout our report, you will see many activities that have been identified. Although this report marks the end of the committee's work, it should be viewed as the foundation for new initiatives regarding sportsmanship and ethical conduct. The report summarizes the committee's activities. It defines the concept of sportsmanship and ethical conduct. It calls for shared responsibilities in these areas and it identifies several existing and new initiatives related to these issues.

The committee acknowledged that these issues are not confined to college athletics. Indeed, in many ways they are a reflection of our larger society. Yet, there is no reason to take comfort or to have complacency in this issue. The NCAA is the most powerful force in sports in America and has the greatest potential to lead in all the sports components—amateur and professional—in bringing about a new order of things. As you review our report, you will note that several leadership initiatives are already under way and should be applauded and encouraged. Tomorrow, you will have the opportunity to vote on two proposals emanating from the committee and supported by the Presidents Commission.

Proposal No. 11 amends the principle of ethical conduct in our constitution to include reference to sportsmanship. This may seem to be a trivial issue, but it is extremely important in reaffirming our values and our priorities in intercollegiate athletics. Proposal No. 12 is a resolution encouraging the development of legislation that will include sportsmanship and ethical conduct as a specific component of the athletics certification program effective during the second five-year cycle. Your support for both of these proposals is requested.

We recognize that sportsmanship and ethical conduct cannot be legislated. Thus, the committee report stretches much further. It attempts to transcend and define the difference between what one has

the right to do and what is right to do. To return to the true spirit of competition for all involved in intercollegiate athletics, to strive mildly but to be gallant in victory or defeat is a noble goal and one richly worth pursuing. I encourage you to read our report. More importantly, I encourage us as an Association to continue to put forth those values that are so important to the integrity of the NCAA. Thank you. (Applause)

**President Corrigan:** Thank you, Bill, for a great job.

At this point in the agenda, we will have the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I will ask the delegates and the visitors and their friends to please remain silent during the reading of the memorial resolutions. Now, may I present Barbara Hick of St. Bonaventure University. Barbara.

#### REPORT OF MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

**Barbara Hick** (St. Bonaventure University): President Corrigan and delegates, at this time I would like to recognize the other members of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. They are Connie Foster, University of Wisconsin, River Falls; and Jo Spearman, Mississippi University for Women.

Following is a list of those men and women who have passed away since we last met:

Francis "Reds" Bagnell, National Football Foundation and College Hall of Fame, Inc.

Arthur D. Barnett, Alabama State University

Joe F. Blair, University of Maryland, College Park

Paul H. Brand, University of Alabama, Huntsville

Philo Brasher, McNeese State University

Bill Callahan, University of Missouri, Columbia

Charles Callahan, University of Notre Dame

Raymond Calvo, Moravian College

Ralph Carpenter, Texas A&M University, College Station

Robert H. Cleveland, University of Southern Mississippi

Ted Collins, St. Mary's College (California)

Rob Crowley, St. Mary's College (California)

J. William Davis, Texas Tech University

Joe Dean, Ohio University

Glen Driscoll, University of Toledo

Bill Esposito, St. John's University (New York)

Gary Fallon, Washington and Lee University

Irwin Fassinger, Carnegie Mellon University

Don Fauls, Florida State University

Don Faurot, University of Missouri, Columbia

Jack Friel, Washington State University

Nenah E. Fry, Sweet Briar College

Howard C. Gentry Sr., Tennessee State University

Alex Groza, Bellarmine College

Labron Harris Sr., Oklahoma State University

Joe Heinsen, College of St. Francis (Illinois)

Nathaniel "Nat" Holman, City College of New York

Robert Holmer, Wichita State University



Jim Lee Howell, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville  
 Grayle Howlett, Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges  
 Ken Hudgens, Vanderbilt University  
 Raymond Hussey, Stetson University  
 Tom Jacobs, University of California, Los Angeles  
 Ray Kist, Niagara University  
 Rev. Michael J. Lavelle, John Carroll University  
 Lay Leishman, Pasadena Tournament of Roses  
 Bobby Lewis, University of Pittsburgh  
 Joel G. Mason, Wayne State University (Michigan)  
 Herb McCracken, Lafayette College  
 Lawrence J. McCreary, Louisiana State University  
 Leo Miles, Howard University  
 W. Harold O'Connor, College of the Holy Cross  
 Harvey Penick, University of Texas at Austin  
 Raymond P. Pepin Jr., Stonehill College  
 Saverio Picariello, Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus  
 Tommy Prothro, Oregon State University  
 Malcolm Quillen, Tennessee Technological University  
 John H. Randolph, College of William and Mary  
 Charles G. "Buzz" Ridl, University of Pittsburgh  
 Hayden Riley, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa  
 John P. Scott Jr., College of the Holy Cross  
 Howard Shannon, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
 George L. Shiebler, Eastern College Athletic Conference  
 John C. "Hi" Simmons, University of Missouri, Columbia  
 Irwin Simone, Grinnell College  
 Gary Spittler, Pembroke State University  
 Edward M. Starling, Marshall University  
 Gil Steinke, Texas A&M University, Kingsville  
 Wesley Stevens, Western Illinois University  
 Rev. Robert Sunderland, University of San Francisco  
 John Sussi, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy  
 Johnny Swaim, Texas Christian University  
 Michael Taylor, Cornell University  
 Lonnie Timmerman, Drake University  
 Tom Tinker, University of Texas at Arlington  
 James M. Van Valkenburg, National Collegiate Athletic Association  
 Joe Vetrano, University of Southern Mississippi  
 Margaret Wade, Delta State University  
 Maurice Wade, Northeast Missouri State University  
 Jack Wallace, Drake University  
 Willie White, Northern Illinois University  
 John Zinda, Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges

The following student-athletes:

David Brown, Pfeiffer College  
 Brian Chafe, University of Akron  
 Sarah Devens, Dartmouth College  
 Eleanor Golding, Tarleton State University  
 Jamal Jackson, Cleveland State University

Willie James III, Jackson State University  
 Raymond J. Laiche, Tulane University  
 Kendall Madison, University of Connecticut  
 Gabe Miller, University of Wisconsin, Platteville  
 Kevin Reichardt, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
 Matthew Skalsky, University of Maryland, Baltimore County  
 Brad Snyder, Northern Arizona University  
 Nakoma Sours, George Mason University  
 Greg Stokes, Angelo State University  
 Emily Town, Gordon College  
 Charles M.D. Tyus, University of South Carolina at Spartanburg  
 Damon Terrell, University of Arizona  
 Henry Wallace, Jackson State University

We ask that you now please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us.

If you know of persons who should be added to the list, please contact a member of this committee or a member of the national office staff. Thank you.

**President Corrigan:** Thank you very much, Barbara. There will be a supplemental report from the committee before the conclusion of the Convention.

We will now conclude this opening session with the annual State of the Association address by our enthusiastic and energetic executive director, Cedric Dempsey.

#### STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

**Cedric W. Dempsey (NCAA):** Thank you, President Corrigan. Before I begin my remarks, I would like to step beyond probably what my authority is. I have great love for our esteemed president, and I am afraid he might become embarrassed while he is presiding over several sessions in front of us. I know we are in a cost-containment mode, but I wonder if I could have a motion from the floor to provide me with the authority to allocate \$10 to President Corrigan so he might send Lena down to buy an extra pair of glasses? I don't know if you have noticed, but those in front might be able to notice that he is holding his glasses together with a paper clip. (Laughter)

**Frederick Hemke (Northwestern University):** I move this be done.

**Joseph N. Crowley (University of Nevada):** I second it.

**Executive Director Dempsey:** It has been moved and seconded.

**Parliamentarian Chapman:** It is out of order. (Laughter)

**Executive Director Dempsey:** Our parliamentarian says it is out of order, but I don't listen to him anymore anyway. All in favor will say "aye"; all opposed?

**President Corrigan:** Who is that who voted against it?

**Executive Director Dempsey:** The members from the Atlantic Coast Conference. (Laughter)

Now, I feel like saying good afternoon. I feel very confident that our president will not be embarrassed during this Convention. Let me add my welcome to all of you—the delegates to the NCAA 90th annual Convention—and especially to the record number of presidents who are in attendance.



It is hard for me to believe I am attending my 30th Convention. As President Corrigan and I the other day were talking about past Conventions, we realized that we had both attended 30 national Conventions. There is only one difference. I started as a representative of the student-athlete advisory board when I first came. (Laughter)

It is equally hard for me to believe that I am beginning my third year as executive director. My first two years have been exciting, rewarding and, in every sense of the word, challenging. I suspect, however, that they will seem quite calm, compared to what is in store over the next few years.

Traditionally, the State of the Association address has been just that—a recap of the past year and an analysis of the current state of intercollegiate athletics. Today, however, I would like to focus upon the future.

The actions of this Convention will have as great an impact on the future of intercollegiate athletics as any Convention in our history of this Association.

I am referring, of course, to the restructuring proposal that will be considered tomorrow.

Before commenting on that legislation, I would like to discuss three of the key issues facing intercollegiate athletics today, because our willingness and our ability to address these issues will determine, in large part, what the state of the Association will be a decade from now.

Let me begin with a critical issue in sports today—sportsmanship and ethical conduct, which is the theme of this Convention. I congratulate Bill Shelton and his committee for their work on this topic over the past 18 months.

The committee recognized that the impact of legislation on fostering ethical behavior is only minor. A far greater impact can be made through the development of effective working relationships among other constituencies. Therefore, the committee has initiated partnerships with the high school federation, the NJCAA, the NAIA, the USOC, and will solicit the professional sports leagues to assure governing bodies from all level of sports work together on this issue.

We must recommit ourselves to preserving these values that have made sports such a positive influence in our lives. We must heed the report of the special committee—which signals the unequivocal importance of these values and sounds an alarm that they are at risk.

As we well know, intercollegiate athletics occupies a special place in the world of sports and in the hearts of the sports-loving public. The status we enjoy, however, is not guaranteed. It must be constantly reinforced and nurtured.

If we dare take it for granted—as we currently risk doing—if we ignore the erosion of those values that have made intercollegiate athletics special—that special place will be lost forever.

Certainly, this means improving the conduct of players on the field. We should be proud of this past football season. The sportsmanship displayed on Saturday afternoon stood in stark contrast to the antics on Sunday.

It also means improving the ethical conduct of coaches on the field, or in the arena—in their treatment of officials and in the values they

instill in their players. It means improving the behavior of fans in their treatment of the opposition. Finally, it means changing the criteria administrators use to make their hiring and firing decisions.

The public will judge us fairly by our actions, not our words. And should our actions ever conflict with our stated values, we will pay a high price.

A second, related issue is the welfare of student-athletes.

Recently, we have taken some important steps to better meet their needs. At its December meeting, the Executive Committee voted to increase the Association's annual commitment to the special-assistance fund from \$3 million to \$10 million.

A special committee has been created to review the management of that fund with an eye toward liberalizing how those funds can be used. The Association also recently increased the academic-enhancement fund allocation to more than \$15 million a year.

Now, here is the impact the increases in these funds will have upon the Association. Over the next seven years, the NCAA will provide nearly \$177 million for direct student-athlete benefits. But, financial assistance alone will not guarantee the welfare and the health of student-athletes.

The world of the student-athlete has changed, every bit as drastically as the world of college presidents, athletics directors and coaches. Yet, I am not convinced that we fully recognize and respond to the real world of today's student-athlete. And, it is not fair to today's student-athletes for us to cling to a vision of intercollegiate athletics as it existed when we were in school. We must remain vigilant in assuring that the athletics demands placed on student-athletes are reasonable.

When young men and women are made to feel that in-season competition is a full-time job, something is terribly wrong.

On our campuses and in the committees of the NCAA, we must continue to listen carefully to what student-athletes tell us about their world, and it is to the realities of their world that we must respond.

The third issue I want to address today is the growing incidence of improper agent involvement with student-athletes.

From 1989 through 1992, we had only one reported incident per year. In 1993, that increased to three incidents. In 1994, it dropped back to two. But in 1995, there have been 17 cases reported.

While the Professional Sports Liaison Committee has focused on agent problems for the last two years, the depth of this problem has only recently become apparent to the full membership. I am glad to report that others have joined the Professional Sports Liaison Committee in recognizing the seriousness of this issue.

A number of constituent organizations, including coaches associations, have initiated educational programs. Recently, the Eligibility Committee made a strong statement by electing to stiffen penalties related to agent cases. It is clear that the time has come for a concerted effort to address this issue.

At its pre-Convention meeting, the NCAA Council approved the formation of a special committee to study agent and professionalism problems and recommend solutions to the membership this year. This effort must not only involve the collegiate community, but also sec-



ondary schools, the professional leagues and their player associations, and every state legislature.

We cannot let the action of a few unscrupulous agents destroy the basic fiber of this organization. But, neither can we ignore the role we have played in creating a climate in which some student-athletes will risk their eligibility for relatively modest benefits.

Our approach to these and other issues facing the Association must be realistic and honest. If we are going to manage the conflicting pressures in intercollegiate athletics effectively, we must first admit that they exist. For our member institutions, the tension between their academic ideals and the financial realities of operating comprehensive athletics programs is real.

The credibility gap between administrators and the coaches they hire and fire is real. So, too, is the cynicism among many student-athletes and the public as they observe the differences between the speeches we give and the decisions we make.

To successfully meet these challenges, we will need the will to address them, which requires overcoming the mistrust that is present in such a competitive environment. We also need an organizational structure that facilitates rather than frustrates that change.

This brings me back to the restructuring proposal before this Convention. This legislation is based on two simple and powerful principles: presidential control and federated governance.

The fundamental purpose of this Association is to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program, and the athlete as an integral part of the student body. Unequivocal presidential control of this Association is vital to this purpose.

So, too, is divisional autonomy. We currently have three distinct divisional missions.

The proposed structure allows each division to establish the administrative and legislative structure to meet the challenges that are unique to that division.

At the same time, there will be Association-wide committees in specific areas, and an Executive Committee with oversight responsibility for the Association's general principles.

With the presidential governing bodies in place, we can then begin to clarify and simplify the substructure of the Association.

As this membership has grown, regrettably our committee structure and levels of bureaucracy have grown as well. A major effort will be made during the transition period to develop a streamlined substructure—one that is more responsive and more efficient to meeting the needs of the Association.

Again, each federated body will have that autonomy within its division, and working together, we can identify the issues and committees that transcend the divisions.

Frequently, I hear from many of you that we have too many rules and regulations. "Why can't we eliminate most of them?" you ask.

Well, we can, of course, but first we must overcome the mistrust that exists among our institutions. Some of that mistrust was evident during this past year—as the oversight committee and the divisional task forces began to draft the restructuring proposal.

But the plan those groups developed and agreed upon—the plan that is before you today—proves that we can put the common good above any parochial interests.

The restructuring proposal is a product of compromise. As such, it is not perfect nor is it exactly what any particular constituency would have drafted alone. But it is a sound and needed improvement in the governance of intercollegiate athletics. I strongly urge your adoption of the proposal and your active participation in this new governing structure.

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said: "This time, like all times, is a very good one, if we but know what to do with it."

This time in intercollegiate athletics is a good time, but it is also a critical one. The challenges we face are considerable, but we wouldn't have it any other way—the thrill of a challenge is what attracted us to sports in the first place.

Knowing the men and women in this room, I am confident that the future of intercollegiate athletics is bright and that the state of the Association in the years ahead will be sound.

I commend you for your dedication and for the decisions you will make this week.

Finally, I want to thank you for the opportunity to be a part of this time in the life of this great Association. Thank you. (Applause)

**President Corrigan:** Thank you, Ced. That was great. These glasses will be fine. That is awful. Isn't that terrible disrespect? (Laughter)

Don't forget, tonight is that wonderful honors dinner where we honor six outstanding student-athletes and six 25-year graduates. With that, the business of this day is concluded.

[The opening business session was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.]



# ■ Division I-A Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1996

The Division I-A business session was called to order at 10 a.m., with Jerry L. Kingston, Arizona State University, presiding.

## OPENING REMARKS

**Mr. Kingston:** If you take your places, we will begin the Division I-A business session. I have the privilege of chairing the Division I-A session this morning.

It is possible that we will be able to complete the Division I-A business at this session. If we are not able to do so, we will continue tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. and continue until our business is concluded, but no later than 9:30 a.m.

Let me call your attention to two Convention publications. First, in the Convention Program you will find the program for this session. On page eight, you will find the program for tomorrow's session. In your Official Notice, see Appendix A. Page 247, the blue pages, lists the seven proposals we will take action on today and, if necessary, tomorrow.

Today, we will first handle the Presidential Agenda Day items and then move on to others as time permits. Please note that on pages two to four of your Convention Program there are corrections in several of the proposals in the Official Notice. They are merely revisions that do not alter the gist of the proposals themselves. Please remember, you will need your voting paddles and electronic voting unit for any vote in this session and throughout the remainder of the Convention. Our procedures dictate that all voting be done by paddle or electronic rather than by voice or by hand. We have a court reporter to prepare a transcript of this session, so we ask you to identify yourselves and your institution or other affiliation when you speak.

We will now consider and act upon the amendments offered for vote in this session. Is there someone who wishes to move the proposal?

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

### NCAA Membership Restructuring

**Robert W. Lawless** (Texas Tech University): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 7-V.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Commission and the Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 7-V.

The cornerstone of the restructuring legislation is the compromise that was reached by the subdivisions of Division I regarding the establishment of a representative system of governance.

In an effort to make the legislative process more efficient and to allow for a more immediate response to changing conditions in Divi-

sion I, the governance system will move to a more representative presence in a "town meeting" forum. Thus, the elimination of the need for a regular Division I legislative session at the annual Convention makes the legislation that authorizes subdivision summer legislative meetings unnecessary.

In the new governance structure, both the Board of Directors and the Division I Management Council are permitted to act separately on certain matters. Thus, this proposal eliminates the needless legislation set forth in Bylaw 5.1.1.3.

On behalf of the Commission and the Council, I urge your support for Proposal No. 7-V.

[Part V of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) was adopted, 115-0.]

### Financial Aid—Summer School—Division I

**Jeremy N. Foley** (University of Florida): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

As stated in the rationale for this proposal, this legislation will allow institutions the flexibility to provide athletically related financial aid to a student-athlete during the summer prior to the student's initial full-time enrollment.

The legislation would restrict the receipt of that summer aid to no more than four additional summer terms and, therefore should not increase costs to institutions. The sponsors believe that allowing such aid during the summer prior to initial enrollment will allow freshmen the opportunity to become adjusted to the college atmosphere.

Finally, this is permissive legislation. It is not mandatory. Institutions that choose not to provide such aid certainly are not forced to do so. I emphasize again it is not a cost-increase issue. Current legislation allows five years of summer-school aid. This proposal allows the exact same aid. It only starts the clock earlier.

This proposal is supported by the Division I Steering Committee, the Presidents Commission, the Academic Requirements Committee as well as the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. It is good legislation. I urge your support. Thank you.

**Gary Gray** (University of Oregon): I have a question about the mechanics of this. For financial aid, you must be certified through the clearinghouse, which normally takes most of the summer. How can you administer aid without having that final certification?

**Mr. Foley:** Obviously, there is an implementation issue with this proposal. The staff and clearinghouse have been aware of it since last August. We honestly believe this is something that can be accomplished by the clearinghouse.

It is legislation that is beneficial to student-athletes. I don't think administrative issues will prevent its passage. We are confident that it can be done with the clearinghouse.

[Proposal No. 34 (Page A-101) was adopted, 58-51-6.]

### Playing and Practice Seasons—First Contest Date— Divisions I and II Football

**Mr. Foley:** On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

Division I-A Business Session



This proposal would change the first permissible date of football to the Thursday preceding Labor Day. Under current legislation, the first permissible contest is September 1 or the preceding Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday.

Allowing the first contest to be played on the Thursday before Labor Day is a more consistent standard and does not fluctuate with the calendar. The Council adopted noncontroversial legislation to effectuate this date in 1995 and 1996. This legislation would simply extend the change to future years. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 79 (Page A-181) was adopted.]

#### **Postseason Bowl Certification—Minimum Wins**

**Homer C. Rice** (Georgia Institute of Technology): I would like to move adoption of Proposal No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent is to permit a Division I-A institution to count one victory against a Division I-AA opponent for the maximum number of six wins necessary to qualify for a postseason bowl game, provided the Division I-AA opponent has awarded an average of at least 60 financial aid equivalencies in football during the preceding three academic years.

I can speak without any self-interest in this proposal. Like so many others, we have been forced to drop all Division I-AA colleges in scheduling due to the present legislation. The rationale on page 185 is overwhelmingly convincing. The printed material in your Convention Program is very clear. Others will speak on these issues, but first I want to make a personal plea to the sanity of this group. Let's help our Division I-AA friends who make a strong commitment to college football. Awarding 60 scholarships over a three-year period is convincing. It not only represents common-sense scheduling in various regions throughout the country, it means survival. I underline "survival" for these programs. Let's help finance their programs and be able to continue to award numerous student-athletes an opportunity to compete. In the name of college football, let's not turn our backs on this plea.

**Robert E. Frederick** (University of Kansas): With the expansion of conferences and consequent decrease in the number of nonconference games, it has become increasingly more difficult and expensive to schedule six home games per year.

Passage of this proposal would be cost-effective and beneficial to Division I-A and I-AA football programs as well. I urge your support of Proposal No. 90.

[Proposal No. 90 (Page A-190) was defeated.]

#### **Personnel—Graduate Assistant Coach—Division I-A Football**

**James P. O'Hanlon** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 97.

This proposal will allow graduate assistant coaches in Division I-A football to make telephone calls to prospects. As stated in the rationale for this proposal, experience in recruiting is an important part of the professional development of new coaches.

It is important for our graduate assistant coaches to have the opportunity for such experience. The calls will be subject to the recruiting legislation. Graduate assistant coaches will have to pass the certifica-

tion exam in order to make the telephone calls. We urge your support of this legislation.

**David T. Braine** (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University): I also rise in support of this proposition. As a former graduate assistant myself, I feel this proposal will help establish a solid foundation for graduate assistant coaches. It will also enable them to learn the recruiting process and the rules before they become full-time coaches. Thus, they gain valuable experience in preparing for their career. I urge your support.

**Hindman Wall** (University of Tampa): I rise in opposition to No. 97. This legislation is not all that important. I think it further tips the educational experiences of the graduate assistants away from their academic education and more toward the coaching profession. I rise in opposition.

[Proposal No. 97 (Page A-195) was adopted.]

#### **Personnel—Graduate Assistant Coach—Division I-A Football**

**Charles M. Neinas** (College Football Association): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 98.

[The motion was seconded.]

I now move proposal No. 98-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

On two previous occasions, we have sponsored legislation that would provide an opportunity to increase the number of graduate assistant football coaches, provided at least one was an ethnic minority.

The question can be raised as to why you have to increase the number of graduate assistants in order to provide more opportunities for ethnic minorities. The number of graduate assistants was reduced from five to two. It became more traditional for head football coaches to seek out coaches who have had previous coaching experience. When you had five graduate assistants, the door was open for more inexperienced people to come into the coaching profession.

It is well-documented that those involved in football coaching today became involved at the graduate-coach level. Not only is it important to provide opportunities for ethnic minorities to become involved in college coaching, but it serves as a training ground for high-school coaches.

The CFA membership was somewhat divided as to how to proceed in presenting this particular legislation. There were some who favored having an additional graduate assistant coach provided to ethnic minorities. Others favored providing an additional graduate assistant coach, provided that one was an ethnic minority. It must be admitted there were some who were philosophically opposed to adding an assistant graduate coach, basing their plan on the fact that you cannot have an ethnic minority as a graduate assistant without increasing the full amount. We have attempted to structure legislation to give the I-A membership an opportunity to vote on either adding a graduate assistant coach by adding one ethnic minority, or by having a third graduate assistant coach by adding two ethnic minorities. This legislation is before you. I hope you will give it due consideration.

**Charles Whitcomb** (San Jose State University): On behalf of the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, I urge you to defeat

*Division I-A Business Session*

77



this proposal. As you recall, the bulk of it has been defeated at two previous Conventions.

While the committee agrees with the concept of encouraging opportunity for ethnic minorities at all levels of athletics, we still feel that this proposal contains some ambiguity. For example, the institution that already has a minority graduate assistant will not be bound by the legislation to hire another minority to fill a third graduate assistant's position, and hence, enhancement is not achieved.

The Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee has recommended to the sponsors on several occasions that they require one of the two graduate positions to be designated for an ethnic minority. The sponsors have not agreed with the committee's recommendation. However, we have presented Proposal No. 98. We feel it is more consistent to have a third graduate assistant coach, provided that at least two are ethnic minorities. I urge that you vote "no" on Proposal No. 98-1.

[Proposal No. 98-1 (Page A-197) was defeated.]

**James M. O'Fallon** (University of Oregon): I could spend the rest of my life arguing on the various issues. But if there has been a single provision that is clearly troublesome in regard to current understanding of the protection policies and the Supreme Court, it is this one.

It in effect puts us in a position of having to create an ethnic or racial consideration as a criteria for employment in our institution, and that is as unconstitutional as anything that has been done in recent years.

**Mr. Whitcomb:** On behalf of the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, I urge you to support this proposal. This proposal would permit an institution to employ an additional graduate assistant coach in Division I-A football, provided at least two of the three graduate assistant coaches are ethnic minorities.

Please note that this is permissive legislation. In order to employ a third graduate assistant coach, an institution must already employ at least one ethnic minority graduate assistant, which accomplishes what the committee has recommended to the sponsors for the past two years—to require at least one of the two graduate assistant positions be designated for an ethnic minority. I urge you to support this legislation.

**Daniel G. Gibbens** (University of Oklahoma): I am not sure that all constitutional law teachers would agree with the interpretation given. I understand there is a basis for it, but with the current cases and the recent one on equal protection regarding minority interests, I am not sure that the Supreme Court wouldn't approve this kind of legislation.

[Proposal No. 98 (Page A-196) was defeated.]

#### **Official Visits—Division I Football**

**Charles M. Neinas** (College Football Association): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 118.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a relatively simple proposal that allows flexibility in the area of utilizing institutional visits. As you all know, the size of your graduating class will determine how many initial grants will be available the following year.

There is really no additional expense. All you are doing is banking six visits from one year to the next year. It cannot be carried over for more than one year. If adopted, this legislation would go into effect August 1, 1996, which means you could not use unused visits from this particular recruiting season next year. In other words, the clock will start August 1, 1996. I understand that this proposal has the support of the NCAA Recruiting Committee.

**William Moos** (University of Oregon): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 118. The current number of official visits is sufficient. The format provided by this proposed legislation would create administrative concerns and could provide an unfair advantage for institutions that could choose to invite a prospect to their campus in order to limit his opportunities to visit other institutions. I encourage you to vote against Proposal No. 118.

**Jeremy N. Foley** (University of Florida): On behalf of the Council, I speak in opposition to this proposal. The proposal is unduly complicated and unnecessary. Additional time will be necessary in tracking the number of official unused visits year after year and calculating how these will be used in the following year does not seem to be time well spent. We believe the current allocation of six official visits is sufficient. On behalf of the Council, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

**Vincent J. Dooley** (University of Georgia): I am the chair of the NCAA Recruiting Committee. The committee spent considerable time in our meeting debating this. We feel like it is legislation that makes a lot of sense. Therefore, the Recruiting Committee recommends that you consider approving Proposal No. 118.

[Proposal No. 118 (Page A-237) was defeated.]

#### **Reconsideration of Postseason Bowl Certification—Minimum Wins**

**David R. Hart** (Florida State University): I voted on the prevailing side. I move to reconsider No. 90.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 90 (Page A-190) was defeated, 44-71-2.]

#### **CLOSING REMARKS**

**Mr. Kingston:** Is there any other item of business that any delegate would like to bring to the attention of the body? Seeing no one approaching the microphone, this concludes the Division I-A business session. We will not be in session tomorrow morning because we have concluded the Division I-A business. Our next meeting will be with the entire Division I membership. Thank you.

[The Division I-A business session was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.]



# ■ Division I-AA Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1996

The Division I-AA business session was called to order at 10 a.m., with Richard J. Ensor, Commissioner, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, presiding.

## OPENING REMARKS

**Mr. Ensor:** Good morning. Welcome to the Division I-AA business session.

*[Note: Division I-AA members of the Council were introduced.]*

Our first order of business today is to present a report on the key issues affecting NCAA membership restructuring. We have with us a number of individuals who have been working on restructuring for the past year on our behalf. They will give us their different views on the issues that we still have in front of us today at the Division I business session.

With me on the dais today is William Harris from Alabama State University, Jeff Orleans from the Ivy Group, and Connie Hurlbut from the Patriot League. I would like to start this short presentation with my distinguished colleague Jeff Orleans from the Ivy Group.

## REPORT

### Report On Membership Restructuring

**Jeffrey H. Orleans** (Ivy Group): This is probably the fourth or fifth time that you've had to suffer through an overview of restructuring, so I will try to make it as short and sweet as I can.

From the Division I-AA, and I think I-AAA perspective, what we have tried to do is to build in specific guarantees for access to championships, access to the revenue stream and access to a unified and accountable voting process so that we will have the kind of competitive and financial opportunities that our subdivisions deserve, and so that we can have as much participation in governance as we think is possible.

I think all of us would have preferred to have one institution/one vote control retained. The alternative with which Division I-A has presented us, is to give that up, in return for certain guarantees. If we couldn't come to an accommodation on that, the very likely possibility existed that they would use the current governing structure, and in particular the Executive Committee, to seek substantial changes in championships revenue distribution. We have been involved in this process and tried very hard to get an accommodation that we thought protected our interests, protected our influence and protected our ability to try to keep Division I athletics in the right academic and amateur context, as we in our subdivisions think it should be.

There are specific guarantees that we think are very essential. They are the revenue guarantee and championships guarantee, which are Proposal Nos. 7-2 and 7-3, and the abolition of separate voting by Division I-A, which is Proposal No. 7-9.

It's been the view of the Division I-AA and I-AAA representatives on the Division I task force and the members of the Council who have worked very, very closely together, that if we can get these guarantees, that this approach is worth our while. It gives us the opportunity to go forward and to get some things that we want for our subdivision. It supports I-AA football. It's a risk worth taking.

Rich, I would leave it to Connie and President Harris to go further.

**William H. Harris** (Alabama State University): Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Bill Harris, and I'm in charge of maintenance at Alabama State University. (Laughter)

Any of you who have ever had a case before the NCAA Committee on Infractions or who is a CEO, know why it's important for you to be in charge of maintenance of the whole enterprise.

When we went into this matter of restructuring, there were several questions that were of major importance. Jeff talked about some of them. We tried to guarantee those in our discussions and in the proposals that come to you now. But paramount among them, in my mind at least, was the "control" network of the NCAA. To whom should the NCAA be responsible in the general scope, and to whom should athletics on our campus be responsible?

In the end, we came to a very clear understanding that in both cases the NCAA and student-athletes on our campuses should be responsible to the CEOs, the presidents and chancellors of the campuses. It is clear to anyone who has been involved in athletics, that athletics touch almost every aspect of a university. Athletics is concerned with our admissions policies, it is concerned with our financial aid policies, it is concerned with our graduation policies. People look at our graduation rates to determine whether or not we are doing anything worthwhile—both in a university's athletics program and in its general operations.

Nobody is more responsible for securing the overall involvement of a university and all these aspects of its life than the chancellor or the president on the campus. If we have an organization that is responsible for looking at us as we perform and participate in athletics, then we also must be responsible for that organization. Thus, the restructuring of the NCAA places major responsibilities on the CEOs. We wanted to talk about this because we need to make clear that if this restructuring plan goes through, presidents and chancellors accept responsibility. When the time comes to serve that responsibility, we must be prepared to take it.

This reorganization includes a Board of Directors that is vested with major responsibility for the overall operation of the NCAA from this point forward if this legislation passes.

I want to enumerate some of the responsibilities of the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors shall establish the general policies for this division. The Board of Directors will adopt bylaws and govern the division. The Board of Directors shall advise the Executive Committee



concerning the employment of a chief administrator of the Association. It will approve an annual budget of the division. It will approve regulations, providing for the expenditure of division funds and the distribution of income for the division. It will approve regulations providing for the administration of division championships. It shall ratify, restrict or rescind actions of the Management Council. The Management Council is the group made up mainly of athletics directors and academic advisors. It shall delegate to the Management Council responsibility for any specific matter. It shall initiate and settle litigation pertaining to the division. And it shall establish a strategic plan for the division.

Simply put, the power, authority and the responsibility for Division I if we pass this legislation places full responsibility, heavy responsibility, on CEOs. We must decide in our institutions and conferences whether this is a responsibility we wish to accept. If so, then we must be committed to make it work.

Now, a word of caution. Any CEO with any sense, and most of us would assume we have a little, would presume that though we have responsibility for the overall governance and maintenance of the athletics network that will be created—the new NCAA—only a fool would dispense with the knowledge and expertise of the people who work for us, who know, on a day-to-day basis, what is required and what is done in the athletics operations on our campuses, and can advise us of the needs of the general operations of the NCAA.

Thus, as we take this responsibility of governance and general oversight, we must do so with the full understanding that we also must continue to depend upon good, well-trained, well-educated and thoughtful people as athletics directors, faculty representatives and coaches. Without that, all of us would do nothing but mess athletics up, because we would not have the basic information on which to make decisions that are intelligent and worthwhile.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is what is before the CEOs of the universities of Division I-AA, and particularly of Division I. I want to reemphasize that I think Jeff is absolutely right. The two major guarantees that Division I-AA institutions wanted are in this legislation: participation and revenue stream. Those are guaranteed.

We commend this to you.

**Constance H. Hurlbut** (Patriot League): I'll try to be brief. I think we've reviewed this a number of times already.

To start with, I won't talk about Proposal No. 7-1 since it doesn't pertain to Division I.

Proposal No. 7-2 is the revenue-distribution guarantee. It is the constitutional guarantee that protects the proportion of total revenue allocated among revenue funds, and contains the formula for allocating such funds as they exist at this Convention. I will note that the Council, the Presidents Commission and the oversight committee have, at their pre-Convention meetings, endorsed and supported this legislation.

Proposal No. 7-3 provides specificity to the access to national championships guaranteed to Divisions I-AA and I-AAA. The language that appears in 7-3 was taken directly from the Division I task force re-

structuring report. It also has received the support of the Council, Presidents Commission and oversight committee.

We "mooted" 7-4 this morning by the adoption of 7-14. Proposal 7-5 is a Presidents Commission amendment that confirms Division I's commitment to assure diversity of representation in all areas of the new governance structure. Proposal 7-6 specifies that the Divisions I-AA and I-AAA conferences that are being represented must meet the appropriate membership criteria to be eligible to have representatives on either the Management Council or the Board of Directors. Proposals 7-7 and 7-8 deal with alternate representatives to the governance body. No. 7-7 deals with the Board of Directors, and 7-8 with the Management Council. Passage of these would permit the constituent body to select an alternate to attend either meetings. I will note that the Council is going to move to refer both 7-7 and 7-8 to the special committee as part of what we will be faced with at the Convention next year.

Proposal No. 7-9, which has also been pinpointed as critical to Division I-AA, eliminates the authority for Division I-A to act separately and for I-AA and I-AAA to act together on federated issues unrelated to football. The Commission and the oversight committee have supported this legislation; the Council has not. Proposal 7-10 sets forth an additional notification requirement in the Division I legislative process so that the membership is notified of legislative decisions following subcommittee, committee or cabinet action. It's the thought that since representation of Divisions I-AA and I-AAA will be through conferences, and that no one will be represented on both bodies, it's important for interconference communication so that all representatives can be informed of divisional positions, and that the notification happens earlier than is specified in the legislation as drafted.

I guess you could call Proposal 7-11 a fall-back to 7-9. It's sponsored as an alternative. If the authority for Division I subdivisions to take separate actions is not eliminated by the passage of 7-9, this amendment specifies that such separate action is subject to a simple majority override, as opposed to a five-eighths. If No. 7-9 passes, it's the intent of the sponsors to withdraw 7-11. Proposal 7-12 would permit conferences to file requests for an override vote on behalf of member institutions, provided that the conference verifies that it has the authority to do so. This is meant to help streamline the override process and to assist Divisions I-AA and I-AAA in that action. Proposal 7-13 establishes a procedure that suspends Division I legislation when at least 100 requests for an override vote are received, so that the membership would not be subject to an action that at least a third of the Division I membership would be seeking to overturn.

That's my brief recap of the amendments. Thank you.

**Mr. Ensor:** This would be the appropriate time for any questions, or for any comments in general on the issue of restructuring.

**Edward B. Fort** (North Carolina A&T State University): I would like to ask my longtime friend and colleague, Jeff Orleans, for some elaboration. Jeff, with regard to revenue, there are protections that relate specifically to revenue exclusivity as it pertains to championships that are garnered only by Division I-A. I'm focusing this strictly on



championship revenue generated by Division I-A, period. If that's true, on what basis do we assume that this is of benefit to Division I-AA, or for that matter Division I-AAA?

There obviously have been some compromises as to the reasons why we, or at least why I, have seen fit to support restructuring. The vote is over and restructuring is in. But I have never been able to obsecrate my opposition to the assumption that the compromise goes so far as to make for the good of the order.

Jeff, is my assumption wrong that there is exclusivity and that that exclusivity is strictly reserved for Division I-A?

**Mr. Orleans:** That's correct.

**Mr. Fort:** On that basis, give me a very narrowly defined response as to how does that, even in the spirit of compromise, benefit Division I-AA?

**Mr. Orleans:** It doesn't. (Laughter)

**Mr. Fort:** Okay. So we're together.

**Mr. Orleans:** It's there because the I-A members of the Division I task force, including the I-A presidential members of the task force, made it very clear that if there was a movement to attempt to share any revenue from a I-A football championship outside of Division I-A, they would oppose any specificity and any guarantees for championships or revenue access for the rest of the division.

**Mr. Fort:** I anticipated that you would give that response. Frankly, I can't deny it. I have to agree that if I was in the Division I-A position, I would do the same thing.

The problem that we have is that this becomes so sacrosanct, now that restructuring is a done deal. At least I assume it is, that we don't have any leverage at all as it pertains to how we can somehow break this steel-like grip that I-A has in this regard. I'm not knocking Division I-A, but it is a reality. For example, if memory serves me correctly, the national championship involved the sharing between two teams within two different leagues, of about \$9 million. The Rose Bowl generally generates between \$12 and \$14 million a year. We don't get one dime of that as Division I-AA teams. Hopefully, some time down the line, chancellors and presidents of Division I-AA universities and colleges will have some way whereby we can get enough reason on the part of the I-A power brokers to accept some kind of entry on our part — that that's just not the right thing to do. I know it's whistling Dixie, but I had to say it.

**Mr. Orleans:** There is an old Jewish saying, "From your mouth to God's ears."

If you, and anyone else who is on the new board of presidents in Division I representing us is able to persuade your colleagues in I-A to do that, we will all be in your debt. But the I-A championship matter was so difficult. Notice how the legislation in Proposal 7-2 is written. Everybody knows it's about the I-A championship, but we weren't allowed to say the words. Division I-A presidents were afraid if the words actually appeared in the constitution, someone would assume they might favor a championship. On the other hand, they were very clear that if there were a championship, which they said they were opposed to, they wanted the money. (Laughter)

You know, there are people negotiating in the Middle East, Ireland and Bosnia who are dealing with much more serious problems than these negotiations. But the concern about the I-A revenue was at least as firm in these discussions as the kinds of firmness that people are dealing with in those more serious problems.

**Mr. Fort:** Jeff, we both agree that we're in a boxed canyon and there doesn't seem to be any exit, except the one that goes through the eye of the needle that is controlled by I-A. I hope that the hardness with which they have gripped this issue does not remain so. Another very, very sticky point under restructuring, is a guarantee for diversity from a sexual and ethnic point of view. My hope is that they will give us some leverage there.

**Mr. Orleans:** I think there is clear support for that. There will be some discussion on the floor about Proposal 9 this afternoon that supports a very clear and accountable set of plans for both ethnicity and gender on the Board and Council levels.

**Mr. Fort:** I'm glad to hear you say that, Jeff. I know others have strongly felt that Proposal 9 is absolutely critical as a benchmark in relationship to this whole battle. I think that reasonable minds will prevail and that I-A will agree. At least I sort of sense that.

On the other hand, there are risks involved in this kind of confrontation. Frankly, I don't have an answer. But I do hope that the leadership for Division I-AA will not allow this issue to just simply vaporize from now on. But I appreciate your response.

**Mr. Orleans:** Rich, since you've left me the mike, if I could just add one comment. As Connie said, the Council and the Commission have agreed to support 7-2, which is the revenue guarantee, and 7-3, which is the championships guarantee. The Commission has agreed to support 7-9, which would abolish separate voting.

I want to urge you, on behalf of all of our Council members and all of our commissioners, to vote "yes" on those proposals, each and every one of you, or as Mayor Daley used to say, "early and often." We need to send a very clear message to our colleagues in Division I-A that we're not going to just slide through on the coattails of the Council and the Commission, that we care very much about these guarantees. The guarantees in the legislation, as unamended, are not worth anything. Our protections lie in these amendments, which were drafted principally by Connie and Rich, who put an enormous amount of work into it. We need to let them know we're going to be vigilant by voting overwhelmingly and unanimously for these guarantees, and not slip by even a single vote on any of them.

**John C. Parry** (Butler University): I just want to explain Proposal No. 10 a little bit.

Knowing restructuring was a probability, trying to understand the guarantees for access to championships and the guarantees that have been outlined by Connie and Jeff, my concern was the guarantee of how much financial aid an individual student-athlete could receive. As I read the principle of financial aid, it essentially said whatever the Association decided. We were about to put the ability to define that in a new Management Council. I thought at the very least the principle ought to say that the maximum amount of financial aid that a student



could receive is the cost of attendance.

I want to be clear. I'm not suggesting that we change the legislation and make it the cost of attendance. I'm trying to put a cap on it. Maybe I could be corrected, but I think all the principles remain one vote/one institution. If No. 10 passes and the Management Council in their wisdom, decide the best thing we can do is offer a stipend to a basketball player of \$1,000 a month in addition to room and board and books, they couldn't do that without coming back and having one vote for one institution to change the principle.

So I'm after the third protection, which is the protection of amateurism or the cost of attendance being what we can legitimately support our student-athletes with. I'm not sure people understand that. That's why I'm trying to urge your support of that amendment.

**Mr. Ensor:** John, are you looking for a straw vote?

**Mr. Parry:** It would help. I think it's a basic issue and a basic principle. I was surprised to read that the answer was, "whatever the Association defines." I just wanted to clean up that third guarantee.

This is a common vote of all three divisions. I think it would be a major change in direction for the NCAA to say we're going to pay players. I don't think it will happen. There are all kinds of other considerations. But this would put it into place as a guarantee that it could not be done without being brought to the floor for a one institution/one vote.

**Mr. Ensor:** We'll do a straw vote. All those in favor of Proposal 10 raise your paddle; all those opposed. It looks like it has overwhelming support, John.

**James Frank** (Southwestern Athletic Conference): My question is directed to Jeff and Connie. Is our position still the same on Proposals 7-7 and 7-8? We indicated earlier that we want to vote "yes" on that, in view of what happened with No. 7-4 being rendered moot. I just want to know what our thinking was on that.

**Mr. Ensor:** Do you want a straw vote on that?

**Mr. Frank:** Not necessarily.

**Mr. Ensor:** There is going to be a Council motion to refer those to the transition committee. In my conference, we were thinking in terms of supporting those, and may vote against the motion to refer.

**Mr. Frank:** I know that's what we discussed earlier. I just wanted to know if there has been a change.

**Mr. Orleans:** Proposals 7-7 and 7-8 would specify that if a member of the Board of Directors in Division I or a member of the Management Council is unable to attend a meeting of either of those two groups, that the constituent body that nominates that person would be able to designate on a standing basis an alternate, who could cast that vote and represent that conference.

I think everybody who has been involved in it agrees that that is better language than what's currently in the book. One question is a concern that the language in No. 7-7 does not specifically say that the alternate member to the Board would have to be a president, although it's pretty clearly understood that the Board of Directors would only let another president in the door, I think.

My sense, Jim, is that whether we defer it or vote for it, we're going

to come out the same way next January. My own inclination is to vote for it. If the transition team then wants to modify it over the year and propose some technical amendment, we can do that. But my own inclination is to get as much of the detail in today as we can to set those ground rules, rather than defer. Anything can be reviewed by the transition teams, or by anybody else for that matter, until next January.

**William H. Harris** (Alabama State University): There are two key issues in this legislation. Jeff pointed them out, but I think we ought to make it clear. It says that the person who is the alternate must be a person who is a standing alternate. So that means that if I'm on the committee and can't come, I just can't call somebody else up and say, "Go down there and cast our vote." That person has to be recognized by the whole group.

The second point is, we can argue about what's in that legislation, but if members of the Board of Directors are CEOs, then the alternate who is designated must be in that same group. I think we need to get everything in here now that we can, and then fuss about the fine points later.

**Mr. Frank:** Rich, what about a straw vote?

**Mr. Ensor:** All those who are in favor of referring the two amendments to the transition committee, please raise your paddles now; all those who are opposed. Fairly strong sentiment opposing it.

**C. Bruce Myers** (Austin Peay State University): A question for Jeff. You've indicated that there will be some receptivity at the transition process on diversity for race, ethnicity and gender. Do you detect any receptivity on the Management Council that there will be an effort to provide a minimum or floor between athletics administrators and faculty representatives?

**Mr. Orleans:** I can only speak for the discussions that I've seen on the task force and among Division I-AA commissioners. In both of those groups we had three concerns. One was to have an effective way of rotating seats on the Board of the Council among the conferences, since one of the real advantages of this process is that each conference finally will be able to have some representation in the governance structure all of the time. A second was a determination that that representation would be diverse, in terms of race and gender. And a third is a determination that it would be diverse in terms of function.

For most of us involved in that process, trying to allocate seats to those groups by all three of those grids turned out to be mathematically impossible. We would be at the point of saying, "The Ivy League seat in 1999 on the Management Council must be a woman faculty representative." Our feeling was that the best accommodation of those three principles would be to allocate seats by conference and to have a very clear set of responsibilities for achieving race and gender diversity. We expect that the nominations that would come from the conferences would reflect that diversity and provide diversity according to function.

The Division I-AA commissioners met a few weeks ago and did a kind of dry-run of what the first two rotations of the Council would look like if each of us put on the people who we thought would provide us the best representation. We had both race and gender diversity, and



a pretty fair diversity by position.

So my own view is that it's unlikely that we'll start to allocate, in any bylaw sense, Council seats by function. It's very clear that we'll be sensitive to that.

In the cabinet structure, which has not yet been put in the legislation and will be the transition team's responsibility, there is a very clear sense that we want some minimum representation by function in each of the four cabinets. I think regardless of your position, you'll be pleased when you see what those drafts will look like.

**Wright Waters** (Southern Conference): I urge the delegates to vote in favor of Proposal 7-9. I want to use an example as the reason why we need No. 7-9 very desperately.

In the late 1980s, an all Division I-A committee—the Special Events Committee—decided that to qualify for a bowl you had to have six wins against I-A opponents. Without any opportunity to consider how that impacted I-AA, it was passed. Since that time, a number of us have worked to try to come up with a compromise that assured the integrity of the bowl teams and at the same time not impact I-AA, particularly those institutions that have historically played I-A teams. That compromise was just voted on in the Division I-A business session and was defeated. It was defeated without a voice from I-AA. It was defeated without the ability of I-AA to make its point in that business session.

So I urge you to look at Proposal 7-9. Although we don't vote on that Management Council and the Board without a majority, we do at least have a voice, which is something different than what we have now.

**Mr. Ensor:** Any other speakers?

I thank our presenters today for their efforts, both today and throughout the past year, on the restructuring process. Thank you.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

**Mr. Ensor:** We will now consider and act upon the amendments offered for vote in this session.

##### NCAA Membership Restructuring

**Kathy Noble** (Big Sky Conference): On behalf of the President's Commission and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 7-W. [The motion was seconded.]

The cornerstone of the restructuring legislation is the compromise that was reached by the subdivisions of Division I, regarding the establishment of a representative system of governance. In an effort to make the legislative process more efficient and to allow for a more immediate response to changing conditions in Division I, the governance system will move to a more representative, rather than a town-meeting, forum. Thus, the elimination of the need for regular Division I legislative sessions at the annual Convention makes the legislation that authorizes subdivision summer legislative meetings unnecessary.

In the new governance structure on both the Board of Directors and the Division I Management Council, representatives of the subdivisions of Division I are permitted to act separately on certain matters. Thus, this proposal eliminates the unnecessary legislation as set forth in Bylaw 5.1.1.4.

On behalf of the Commission and the Council, I urge your support for Proposal 7-W.

[Part W of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) was adopted, 122-1.]

#### Playing and Practice Seasons—First Contest Date— Divisions I and II Football

**Wright Waters** (Southern Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is good legislation. The experience of our leagues playing the Thursday before Labor Day has given them an opportunity to have nice crowds, as opposed to the Saturday before Labor Day because of people going on vacation. With our Division I-AA playoff the way it is, and our season having to end earlier than the I-A season, we're almost forced to either play on that Thursday or that weekend. So we would urge your support for 79.

**Sondra Norrell-Thomas** (Howard University): The Council adopted noncontroversial legislation to affect this change in 1995 and 1996. The Council is supportive of this amendment.

[Proposal No. 79 (Page A-181) was adopted.]

#### REPORT

**Mr. Ensor:** We will now move on to a report on the Special Committee to Study NCAA Marketing. Britton Banowsky from the Southland Conference will give that report.

##### Report of the Special Committee to

##### Study NCAA Marketing

**Britton B. Banowsky** (Southland Conference): I'm pleased to be in a position to report on behalf of the the Special Committee to Study NCAA Marketing, Licensing and Promotional Activities.

There are 16 members of the committee, 12 of whom are Division I-A representatives. We have two Division I-AA representatives, of which I am one. We have two Division I-AAA representatives on the committee, for a total of 16. I appreciate very much the strong representation of Rich Ensor and Connie Hurlbut as Council members. They noticed this disproportionate set-up on this committee and encouraged the Council to go back in and add additional members to represent the other Division I interests. So it's my pleasure to do that, and to report to you today on the actions of that committee. Actually, they haven't done anything. We've only met once, so this will be a very brief report.

The committee is charged with examining all current efforts and issues related to the marketing, licensing and promotion of the NCAA, its championships and its marks, and to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee as to the future direction of these activities, the appropriate level of NCAA involvement in them and how they best can be managed in the future.

The committee is in its early stages of work. A significant portion of the first meeting was spent educating the committee members on all of these various activities. We learned, among other things, that the NCAA has a corporate partner program that generates a significant amount of revenue to the Association. We also learned that the corpo-



rate partner program is currently administered outside of the NCAA by Host Communications. But there is a significant amount of interest in exploring whether or not that enterprise should be brought in-house, rather than leaving it with an outside agency. There are both domestic and international licensing programs, which also generate a significant amount of revenue for the Association. These include retail licensees, an official concessionaire, an official ball program, a cross-licensing program, a licensing program in the Far East and a licensing program in Europe.

The Association is very active in these areas. There is a lot of information out there that I did not know about and would suspect that many of you as well are not aware of.

The threshold question considered by the committee was the appropriate role of the Association in these matters, and fundamentally, whether the Association has a fiduciary responsibility to us, its members, to maximize revenue in all of these areas. That issue remains outstanding. It's a question of philosophy and where the line should be drawn in terms of marketing the Association.

To further the work of the committee, four subcommittees were formed: a subcommittee to study the corporate partner program in more detail; a subcommittee to study the licensing program; a subcommittee to look at that fundamental philosophical question; and then finally, interestingly enough, a subcommittee to look at revenue distribution.

As you know, we have an issue in restructuring on how revenue should be distributed. So it will be very interesting to see how this process evolves. I believe it's anticipated that the committee will work through the spring and be in a position to make a recommendation to the Executive Committee no later than August. I would very much appreciate any input that I could receive from the Division I-AA membership.

**Mr. Ensor:** I have one, Britton. On the revenue distribution, we've talked about that extensively in relation to Proposal No. 7-2. I think perhaps the issue that we should really look at a little closer with that subcommittee on marketing is whether or not there will be efforts by Division I-A to divert existing sources of marketing revenue, albeit at a lower level than what we may anticipate in the future, outside of the current stream to the membership as it's distributed through broad-base sports sponsorship and the basketball pool.

We had a discussion on that at the commissioners meeting Saturday. I wonder if you could comment a little bit more on some of the friction we can anticipate on that issue.

**Mr. Banowsky:** It surprised me that we would have such a subcommittee inasmuch as we had legislation pending before the Association that in my mind answered the question about those existing revenue streams and how they will be distributed. In other words, isn't that in essence what we're doing here today?

Our conference asked the question to the NCAA staff: "Are the current marketing, licensing and promotional activities of the Association considered part of the current revenue stream?" If we pass amendment-to-amendment 7-2, it obviously would answer the question. The

answer we got from the NCAA is just that, that the restructuring legislation would take care of that.

So what will be fascinating to see, in my mind, is what work the subcommittee does, if any, in light of that.

## DISCUSSION

**Mr. Ensor:** Are there any other questions at this time for Britton? Thank you, Britton. We look forward to your report.

This is the portion of the meeting that we devote to other business. It would be appropriate for any member to step to a microphone to bring a topic up for discussion on any legislative item or other item of concern to the Division I-AA membership.

I was anticipating that we would have some discussion on possible CFA membership for Division I-AA members. The I-AA athletics directors met this weekend and indicated they wanted to discuss that at the end of this business meeting. Is there a presenter on that topic?

**Charlotte West** (Southern Illinois University at Carbondale): Not on that topic, but I'd like to comment on Proposal 104. This involves recruiting in basketball. As you know, currently we have a limit of five: three contacts and two evaluations. This proposal would still maintain the five so there is not an increase in cost, and still maintain a maximum of three contacts. But it would allow more than two evaluations if the coaches would prefer to evaluate, rather than to have contact off campus.

That seems rather clear. That was supported strongly by the NABC, by the Women's Basketball Coaches, by the Recruiting Committee and by the Council.

Much to the surprise of many people, when we arrived at the Convention, there was an interpretation that rather confuses the issue. The Interpretations Committee, as you'll see on your list of new interpretations, indicates that the evaluations would affect other than seniors. This is a change in our present operating policy. We're hoping the assembly—and Division I-AAA has already handled this—will go ahead and vote on the motion as presented and not be disrupted by this new interpretation. Then there will be a motion to refer the interpretation to the post-Convention Council meeting. I think that would be the appropriate way to handle it.

That had caused concerns in many of your meetings yesterday. I wanted to urge your support of Proposal No. 104 and not be sidetracked because of this change in interpretation.

**John C. Parry** (Butler University): I would like the group's feeling about the Great Eight basketball exemption—Proposal No. 78. It might appear as though if you're opposed to it, you're opposed to CHAMPS, which is really not a very fair analysis.

I would like to propose next year that every single school get to take one game as an exemption with all of the proceeds going to CHAMPS. In other words, I'm not opposed to CHAMPS. I'm not opposed to an exemption. I am opposed to eight schools getting it. I would like some other discussion or a straw vote.

**Mr. Ensor:** Is there any other speaker on Proposal 78? We're looking for a straw vote on that proposal. As I understand it, Proposal 78



would provide Great Eight participants with an annual exemption. It puts them in a category that doesn't require certification, as the proposal is currently written.

Those in favor of Proposal 78; those opposed. Thank you. There seems to be moderate opposition.

**Frederick S. Humphries** (Florida A&M University): I'm not enamored with the restructuring proposal. I would just like to cite one reason for that, then I want to ask a question of Division I-AA.

Number one, even in the present structure of the NCAA, we are not democratically represented. I don't think we preserve at all, in the management decision and the policy-making decision of our organization, one man/one vote. The Division I-A schools occupy an inordinate position on the NCAA Council and the Presidents Commission. Now we have locked that in and we are federating the various divisions. We are making it possible for Division I-A to make its own decisions. It seems to me that we've given away a lot in terms of doing that.

We now are the recipient of benevolent activities and look for the kindness of Division I-A to do things for us and the rest of the NCAA since they have on the Executive Committee 50 percent of the voting capacity. We only have two votes on that committee.

Are we going to do something similar? It's like introducing a computer system. People are running parallel for a while, before they actually buy into and turn themselves over to the entire new system. They look at how the new system works in comparison with how the old system worked, until it all kind of matches up and then it takes off.

Are we going to have some kind of monitoring device in the early stages of this restructuring change so that the membership of Division I-AA might have some kind of evaluative mechanism to say how this new structure is working and how it is benefiting us or how it is affecting us in our participation in the NCAA? Is there any thought process being given by the leadership of our division to some regular, organized way of the membership asking: "Is this change working in the way we think it's going to work? Is it proving to be beneficial to us?" Do we leave it up to chance to happen? That's my basic question to the leadership of Division I-AA.

**Mr. Ensor:** From my perspective as a Council member, there is going to be an 18-month transition period, starting from the end of this Convention where there will be dual operating bodies. The new Board of Directors and Council will be constituted, under my understanding at least, some time in the near future. They will handle the detail work of filling in the big voids that we currently have in the new governance system. We have really just put in an overview, if we keep proceeding today as it's gone this morning, with restructuring.

So for the next year, that group will be working toward the 1997 Convention to further develop the plan. They will present the detail work that they have developed as part of the current Council's continuing governance authority to present to the 1997 Convention. That will come forth probably by August for the Council to review and to put forth for the membership to vote on at the January 1997 Convention.

There will then be another six-month period where both bodies con-

tinue, with the current Council going out of business, as I understand it, in August of 1997. Outside of that, I'm not aware of any evaluation process that will be going on. Could any member of the oversight task force that is involved in these discussions approach a mike and perhaps discuss it further?

**Jeffrey H. Orleans** (Ivy Group): It strikes me, Rich, that we would expect to have a meeting like this again at the 1997 Convention. I think it's now anticipated that there will continue to be annual Conventions, at least early into the restructuring process so that the subdivisions can continue to meet. We would continue to have a Division I-AA meeting for just that reason in those early Conventions.

So I would hope that we would use the new—if you want to call it "shadow" government—transition team. People should be in close touch with their conference representatives in those bodies and use their league meetings as an opportunity to review what's being proposed for the transition.

**Mr. Ensor:** Thank you, Jeff.

Any other comments on that topic? Any other comments on any other business related to I-AA?

**Gene Bleymaier** (Boise State University): In regard to your comment regarding the CFA membership, I think it would be easiest if we could just ask the athletics directors to wait at the end of this meeting and gather for about five minutes. There are a couple items that the Association would like to discuss with the athletics directors. So if they could stay behind at the adjournment of this meeting, it would be appreciated.

**Mr. Ensor:** Okay, Gene. That's fine.

Any other business items for Division I-AA?

The I-AA business meeting is closed. There will be no requirement for a meeting tomorrow. You have now earned yourself an hour and fifteen minutes of free time. Thank you.

[The Division I-AA business session was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.]



## ■ Division I-AAA Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1996

The Division I-AAA business session was called to order at 10 a.m. by Chris Monasch, Northeast Conference.

*[Note: Because no votes were taken in the session, the following is a summary of the discussion. Only discussion of a significant nature concerning the proposed amendments is summarized. A verbatim transcript is on file in the Association's national office.]*

### OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Monasch welcomed the delegates and introduced the Division I-AAA members of the Council. After he referred the delegates to corrections to certain proposals in the Official Notice, Mr. Monasch invited the delegates to step forward with comments or questions about proposed legislation.

### REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Delegates asked for a straw vote on Proposal 19 and Proposal 17. The vote showed substantial opposition to both proposals.

A delegate asked for a straw vote on Proposal No. 21 and urged delegates to oppose the proposal. A vote showed about two-thirds of the delegates opposed the proposal.

A delegate stated his opposition to Proposal No. 35 and asked for a straw vote. A vote showed substantial opposition to the proposal.

A delegate spoke in favor of Proposal No. 78 and asked for the delegates support of the proposal. Another delegate likened Proposal 78 to Proposal 69 in that both proposals deal with contest exemptions. A straw vote on Proposal No. 78 did not indicate a clear majority for or against the proposal.

Questions about a Council interpretation of Proposal No. 104 arose and the delegates took a straw vote that indicated a majority favored the proposal as interpreted by the Council.

The delegates took a straw vote to cancel Tuesday's session and the meeting was adjourned.

[The Division I-AAA business session was adjourned at 10:25 a.m.]

## ■ Division II Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1996

The Division II business session was called to order at 10 a.m., with Division II Vice-President Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University, presiding.

### OPENING REMARKS

**Ms. Dorn:** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Lynn Dorn, director of women's athletics at North Dakota State University. On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I'd like to take this opportunity to welcome each and every one of you to the Division II business session. In particular, the steering committee would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and to show appreciation for the presidents who have joined us this morning.

After the historical vote this morning, we are even more appreciative. We look forward to a positive working relationship as we move forward with the details of restructuring. I'd also like to welcome our parliamentarian this morning, Mr. Paul Engelmann, professor of economics at Central Missouri State. Paul, I'm sure that you'll serve as a compliance officer this morning and make sure we run a very efficient meeting.

*[Note: Various introductions and announcements were made and voting procedures were explained.]*

Before we begin, it has been traditional in the Division II business session to review the legislative proposals. This year, however, the Division II Steering Committee has elected to deviate from that tradition. We will not review legislative proposals. The major issues—membership restructuring and athletics certification—have been reviewed in detail.

We are now ready to begin this morning's session with the voting of Proposal No. 7.

### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

#### NCAA Membership Restructuring

**Adam W. Herbert** (University of North Florida): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission, the Council and the Division II Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure, I move the adoption of Proposal Nos. 7-L, 7-O, 7-R, 7-AA, 7-FF and 7-HH.

*[The motion was seconded.]*

If there are no objections, I am hopeful these six specific sections of Proposal No. 7 can be considered in a single vote. They establish the division-specific governance structure for Division II.

Initially, I will be joined by President McGowan and President Asher who serve with me as members of both the Presidents Commission and the Division II reorganization task force. They will speak in favor of Proposal No. 7-L, a proposal to establish the Division II Presidents Council. Doug Echols, Jerry Hughes and Karen Miller, athletics

Division II Business Session

95



administrators who have served on the Division II task force to review the structure, will then speak in support of Proposal No. 7-O, which will establish the Division II Management Council.

Finally, I will speak in favor of Proposals 7-R, 7-AA 7-FF and 7-HH. These sections set forth legislation to make the necessary changes in the Division II legislative process. Presidents Asher and McGowan will now comment on the Presidents Council.

**Betty Turner Asher** (University of South Dakota): The adoption of Proposal No. 7-L will establish a Division II Presidents Council as the primary policy-making body for the Division II membership.

Under the current structure, the Presidents Commission, including the Division II subcommittee of the Commission and the Division II Steering Committee of the Council have similar authority and there are chances for conflict. Those may exist if the two bodies cannot reach a consensus on a particular issue. Although the two bodies attempt to minimize such conflict through continuous communication, it is important that one presidential body be vested with the authority to direct the general policy of Division II.

One of the primary objectives of the reform agenda has been to increase presidential involvement in policy-making decisions regarding the proper role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education.

The establishment of a Presidents Council will provide the necessary presidential control and accountability. It will establish a clear and effective relationship between presidents and administrators who are charged with the daily administration of the athletics program. In response to concerns regarding the schedules of institutional CEOs and the necessary time commitment to participate in this restructured Association, I believe one only needs to look to the past to see the dedication that Division II presidents have exhibited as it relates to their time commitment to conduct the Association's business. Many CEOs have spent time on the Presidents Commission, the Council and various NCAA committees. In addition, in more recent years, the presidents have demonstrated their commitment to a more hands-on approach in intercollegiate athletics by leading the charge in the Association's reform movement.

I think it is important to emphasize that the proposed governance change does not necessarily mean an increased time commitment. It merely makes presidents accountable by vesting them with ultimate and direct authority. It is true the presidents will have increased responsibilities in this new structure, but many of the tasks and assignments will be rightfully delegated to the athletics administrators on the Management Council.

In essence, the Presidents Council will function primarily in an oversight capacity. The Presidents Commission, the Council and the Division II task force have proposed this new governance structure and believe that the establishment of the Presidents Council provides the presidential control and leadership that is so essential as we look to the future of Division II.

**Joseph J. McGowan Jr.** (Bellarmine College): The composition of the Division II Presidents Council is based on a weighted regional representation by institutions that will include one chief executive officer

per region for every 22 institutions in that region.

The Division II Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure believes that to ensure an effective governance structure, it was essential that the presidential governing body remain small in size, somewhat analogous to the current Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission.

Rather than tamper with the current regional structure, the task force looked at the number of institutions in their respective regions in determining the appropriate regional representation on the Council. The task force also was very sensitive to the need to achieve diversity of representation on the Presidents Council as well as to accommodate those institutions that are not affiliated with any conference. Thus, two at-large positions will exist to enhance those efforts.

Further, to the extent possible, CEOs from the same conference will not be permitted to serve concurrently on the Division II Presidents Council. As referred to earlier, the Division II Presidents Council will be responsible for the establishment and direction of the policy of Division II. It will be responsible for implementing policies adopted by the Association's Executive Committee, establishing a strategic plan for Division II, developing and approving the budget, and using funds allotted to Division II as well as approving regulations providing for expenditures and income to Division II.

The Presidents Council will have the authority to sponsor Division II legislation, adopt noncontroversial and intent-based amendments, administer bylaws and regulations governing Division II between Conventions, and will delegate to the Division II Management Council responsibilities for specific matters as it deems appropriate. Ultimately, the Presidents Council will be responsible for approving recommendations of the Division II Management Council, including the ratification or rescission of any actions by that body.

Finally, the Presidents Council will be responsible for assuring that gender and ethnic diversity exists among its membership, members of the Division II Management Council and members of each of the other bodies in the Division II administrative structure.

Regarding election and terms of office, members of the Presidents Council will serve four-year terms and will not be eligible for immediate reelection. This will ensure that more CEOs have the opportunity to serve on the Presidents Council. The chair and vice-chair of the Council shall serve one-year terms. Members must serve a minimum of one year on the Council prior to serving as chair or vice-chair. Vacancies among members of the Presidents Council will be selected by the Council itself after a formal call for nominations. Those nominations will be published in *The NCAA News*.

Further, an informational letter to solicit nominations also will be mailed to the institutions and conferences in the regions where the vacancies exist.

In closing, President Herbert, Asher and I as well as the Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission, the Division II Steering Committee and the Division II Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure strongly believe that this model will serve the Division II membership well. We urge your support for the adoption of Pro-



posal 7-L.

Jerry Hughes, director of athletics at Central Missouri State, will now speak to you about the Management Council.

**Jerry M. Hughes** (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the steering committee of the NCAA Council, the Division II subcommittee for the NCAA Presidents Commission and the Division II Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure, I speak in support of Proposal 7-O, which will establish a Division II Management Council.

The Division II Management Council will be subordinate to the Presidents Council, but will nonetheless have a significant role within the new structure—the day-to-day responsibilities related to the administration of Division II intercollegiate athletics programs. The Management Council will perform functions similar to the current Division II Steering Committee of the Council. It will recommend the adoption of noncontroversial and intent-based amendments, administrative bylaws, and regulations that govern Division II, all subject to the ratification by the Division II Presidents Council.

It will also make recommendations to the Division II Presidents Council on matters it deems appropriate, including proposed legislation that is in the best interest of Division II. You will take final action on all matters delegated to it by the Presidents Council, make interpretations regarding the application of legislation, appoint members to committees that comprise the Division II substructure and review recommendations from those committees.

Doug Echols, commissioner of the South Atlantic Conference, will speak to you now regarding the composition of the Management Council.

**Doug Echols** (South Atlantic Conference): The Division II Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure, in determining the appropriate composition of the Division II Management Council, decided early on that the new structure should ensure greater access and opportunity to all constituents that make up Division II. The best avenue for accomplishing this was to utilize conference organizational structures.

Thus, it was determined that the Division II Management Council should be comprised of one administrator or representative from each of the Division II multisport voting conferences. This will ensure that each conference will have a voice in the new structure and establish a direct communication link between the Council and the membership. Further, the task force noted the importance of enhancing efforts to achieve diversity and representation. Thus, two at-large positions will exist to address those concerns.

Finally, there will be one representative on the Council for the Division II independent institutions. Karen Miller will now add some comments about the Management Council and the selection process.

**Karen L. Miller** (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): Thank you, Doug. Good morning.

It's my pleasure to share with you this morning the ideas of the task force regarding composition and selection of the Management Council members. The task force strongly believes the Management Council should be comprised of athletics administrators who hold various posi-

tions at the institutional and conference level. This will enable the group to better address all the challenges put before it.

To meet this objective, the Management Council will have a minimum of four directors of athletics, four senior women administrators, at least four faculty athletics representatives and at least one conference administrator. In addition, members of the Division II Presidents Council and Division II Management Council shall not be employed at the same institution. The task force believes that this new model will provide greater involvement of conferences in the governance structure and will also provide the necessary access that now may be deemed lacking under the current structure.

Finally, I would like to comment briefly on the selection process. When a vacancy occurs on the Division II Management Council, each conference will be asked to prepare a slate of candidates that shall include a faculty athletics representative, a senior woman administrator and a director of athletics chosen at the discretion of a conference administrator. Members of the Management Council will then select individuals to fill the vacancies from this slate of candidates in accordance with the need to meet diversity.

On behalf of Jerry, Doug, myself, as well as the Presidents Commission, the Council, and the Division II task force, I strongly encourage your support of Proposal No. 7-O. Now, it's my pleasure to return the microphone to President Herbert.

**Adam W. Herbert** (University of North Florida): Thank you. I would like now to briefly voice support of Proposal Nos. 7-R, 7-AA, 7-FF and 7-HH. These are essentially housekeeping proposals.

Proposal No. 7-R basically provides the avenue to achieve regional representation on the Presidents Council by eliminating geographical districts. It is important to note that during the transition process, attention can be given to the question of whether modification should be made in a current regional structure to provide for a more balanced distribution of institutions.

The remainder of these proposals set forth the new legislative process that will exist under the new structure. It was very important to the Division II task force that the current one-institution/one-vote principle be maintained in the new structure. Therefore, annual Conventions will continue to be held in which each of our institutions will be permitted to vote on varying proposals related to Division II operations. There was consensus among the task force members, however, that legislative sponsorship requirements should be reconsidered by the Division II membership. Concern was expressed that current sponsorship requirements allow a small number of institutions or, in some cases, even a single conference to put forth legislation that may have little or no chance of passing at the Convention. In some instances, legislation may be of interest only to a small number of sponsors. Thus, it is proposed that sponsorship requirements be increased to require legislative proposals to be sponsored by either the Division II Presidents Council, by 15 or more active member institutions with voting privileges in Division II or by at least two member conferences with voting privileges in Division II on behalf of 15 or more of their active institutions. These requirements will undoubtedly reduce the vol-



ume of legislation that comes before the Division II membership at the annual Convention and will ensure that more meaningful and more representative proposals are considered.

Finally, similar to the process that exists under the current structure, the legislative process will permit the Division II Presidents Council at the recommendation of the Management Council to adopt noncontroversial legislative amendments that are clearly necessary for the orderly and normal administration of the division.

On behalf of the Presidents Commission, the Council and the Division II Task Force to Review the Membership Structure, I urge your support for the sections that we have just described. Thank you very much.

**Ms. Dorn:** Thank you. Is there any further discussion concerning Proposal 7-L, O, R, double A, double F, and H? If not, we are prepared to vote.

[Parts L, O, R, AA, FF and HH of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) were adopted, 245-1-1.]

#### Division II Athletics Certification

**Judith A. Ramaley** (Portland State University): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I move Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

Over the past 15 months, the Special Committee to Study Division II Athletics Certification, which has been chaired by President Don Lubbers of Grand Valley State University, has worked diligently to develop an athletics certification program consistent with the philosophies, needs, interests and resource limitations of Division II.

In an effort to seek input from the membership on this proposed certification program, members of the special committee visited most of the conferences this fall. In the course of discussing restructuring, members of the Presidents Commission have spoken to a number of their colleagues about certification as well. We learned that during both these phone conversations and conversations at the Council meetings, that members are still concerned about costs, time commitments associated with the certification program and had not had much of an opportunity to review this process because of the overwhelming interest and concern about restructuring.

It became apparent that the restructuring has dominated everyone's interest and concern this year. As a result, full, meaningful exchange on both the merits and the issues involved in athletics certification simply could not take place.

In spite of these limitations, the special committee felt that it was absolutely essential to bring this proposal to the floor of the annual Convention because it was our concern that should we not be able to obtain funding from general funds available to the Association, that we would not be able to manage the administrative costs after we became a separate federated division and would be forced to utilize funds from resources allocated to us directly.

Fortunately, however, we recently learned from the Administrative Committee that the Division II athletics certification program, which appeared on the spring 1995 agenda, can be funded under current budget procedures, provided it passes by the 1997 Convention. It is

our feeling that with an additional year, the special committee will have the opportunity to address adequately the concerns that have been expressed by the membership and work toward an overwhelming and unconditional acceptance of the certification program by the Division II membership.

Such commitment is needed to ensure that certification becomes a meaningful form of self-study and a vehicle for the improvement of intercollegiate sports. It's important to mention at this point that both the Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council are supportive of the certification concept, have enthusiastically supported the work of this special committee and believe that with time we will develop the best possible program for all members.

Therefore, on behalf of the Presidents Commission and NCAA Council, I move that Proposal No. 16 be referred back to the special committee to study Division II athletics certification for further study and that the work be resubmitted to the 1997 convention. Thank you.

[The motion to refer the proposal was seconded.]

**Robert E. Hartwell** (Adelphi University): I hope that the body will oppose the motion to defer simply because I think it's an appropriate time for us to defeat this motion completely at this Convention.

As was stated, the special committee visited various conferences and various institutions. Overwhelmingly, the indication has been that Division II does not want this certification program. Putting it off for another year is not in our best interests. I urge everyone to defeat the motion to defer, bring it to the floor and then defeat it. Thank you.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 16 (Page A-55) was defeated, 93-147-4.]

**Ms. Ramaley:** The concept of certification is a particularly important one for Division II for a number of reasons. We continue to find that there are questions about the integrity of intercollegiate sports programs in Division II from time to time. We also find that there are a number of important ways in which the presidents' agenda for reform of intercollegiate sports applies particular emphasis in Division II with respect to presidential leadership, the issues of the student-athlete experience, student-athlete welfare, academic experience and cost-containment.

The idea of voting for a much more simplified certification program in Division II was designed to accomplish with minimum cost and time an opportunity to demonstrate to our campus communities, to our local communities and to a national audience that Division II sports are conducted with integrity, with consistent concern for the student-athlete, and with concern for the best possible opportunities for all students who are associated with these programs.

We have heard concerns in many of the conversations that I alluded to earlier. They had to do primarily with the amount of time that would be spent, which, in fact, would be no greater than the current five-year self-study, and the cost, which, in fact, compared to Division I, is quite minimal since it would involve a minimum number of outside evaluators. We heard some concerns expressed about whether or not certification really was relevant to the issues of Division II.

I would argue that certification is an appropriate program for us to



undertake as proposed in the legislation before you. It is simple, it is straightforward, it requires very little time. It requires no more effort than our current self-study. But it does promote presidential leadership. It does promote regular review and an opportunity to demonstrate the quality of the programs that we provide other student-athletes. Thank you.

**Kent Wyatt** (Delta State University): I speak on behalf of the Special Committee to Study Division II Athletics Certification in support of Proposal No. 16.

Nearly 2½ years ago, a joint subcommittee of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council was formed to study the concept of athletics certification for Division II. A year later in the spring of 1994, this joint subcommittee issued a report supporting the concept and the appointment of a special committee to design such a program for Division II to consider at this Convention.

Over the past 15 months, I have had the pleasure of serving as a member of the this special committee, which was composed of three presidents, five athletics directors, a faculty athletics representative and a consultant to the Presidents Commission. Throughout this formative year, the special committee remained committed to developing a program consistent with the philosophy of the needs, the interests, the resources and the resource limitations of Division II.

Yes, we did look very closely at the existing Division I certification program and we did incorporate many of those elements that have proven successful during the early implementation of that program. After all, the four self-study areas in the Division I program are identical to those found in the Division II proposal. These areas are governance and commitment to rules; academic integrity; fiscal integrity; and a commitment to equity.

In short, we took the best of the Division I program, incorporated the needs and interests of Division II with an emphasis on simplification and cost reduction, and developed a meaningful and realistic athletics certification program for your consideration. For example, the number of items as well as the amount of printed information institutions would be expected to provide have been reduced significantly. Even more importantly, the Division II program would require each institution to complete a comprehensive self-study only once every 10 years as opposed to every five years as is required in Division I.

Instead, an interim self-study would be conducted at the midpoint between the comprehensive self-studies. The interim self-study would be an abbreviated version of the comprehensive self-study and would not include a peer-review visit. The result is a viable certification program that provides each and every Division II institution with a management tool characterized by openness and campus-wide participation for: one, educating the campus community about the athletics program and its goals and its purposes; two, emphasizing many of the positive aspects of athletics; and, three, identifying areas of improvement. Add in the perspective provided by respected and experienced peer reviewers and you have a program that can improve the quality of intercollegiate athletics on each of our campuses and all across Division II.

For that reason, I urge your support of Proposal No. 16.

**David P. O'Toole** (Bellarmine College): As a member of both the NCAA Council and the Special Committee to Study Division II Athletics Certification, I urge your support for Proposal No. 16.

Most of the concerns expressed frequently to the special committee as it developed the athletics certification proposal that is now before you focused on the time and the financial commitment associated with conducting the self-study. To review any enterprise on campus in an open and meaningful process will exact a price both in terms of time and resources.

Given the visibility of athletics on our campuses, the consequences of operating athletics in a questionable manner and the growing demand for accountability in every area of activity, it would appear to be a price we could ill afford not to pay. One should view athletics certification not as an expenditure, but as an investment in preserving both the integrity of our institutions individually and the Association as a whole. In developing the athletics certification program, the special committee went to great lengths to minimize the costs while maintaining a meaningful self-study process that will open the doors of athletics to the full university community and the public at large.

In his remarks, President Wyatt talked about the reduction in time that could be achieved by conducting the athletics self-study concurrently with one regional accreditation. Furthermore, the special committee has continually emphasized that athletics certification is an institutional endeavor that requires the full support of the chief executive officer and the involvement of all significant campus constituents. It is hoped that this campus-wide involvement will result in the athletics department playing primarily a supporting role in the self-study process with much of the costs being assumed institutionally and the time commitments disbursed across the campus.

Unquestionably, the most direct costs associated with the process are those related to hosting the peer-review team on its campus visit. Based in part upon the experiences of the Division I program, it would appear that the average cost will be about \$1,000 per peer reviewer. With teams consisting of two or three members, the total cost of hosting the team should be approximately \$3,000.

The indirect costs to conduct the self-study itself are far more difficult to project and could vary significantly from campus to campus. It is safe to say, however, that the amount of work necessary to complete the self-study should be comparable to that of any other major committee or self-study activity on campus. Also, it is very important to keep in mind that many of the costs, particularly those associated with the peer-review teams, are incurred only once every 10 years. All things considered, the cost of athletics certification appears to be a small price to pay to help to ensure that athletics programs are operating in a manner consistent with the individual institutional mission and with acceptable national standards.

I urge your full support of Proposal No. 16.

**Raymond L. Orbach** (University of California, Riverside): I speak in support of Proposal No. 16. My perspective is that it will take athletics out of an isolated and special format that it so often falls into



and will give the entire campus an opportunity to review its role in the academic and athletics mission of the campus. I think it's important to bring student-athletes into the full spectrum of activities of the campus and I think it would be a welcoming and supportive process. So I speak in support of Proposal 16.

**Robert E. Hartwell** (Adelphi University): We oppose this legislation for a number of reasons. First of all, we've often wondered what motivated the group to study this and bring it before Division II. Division II now has the opportunity to legislate for itself and to make its own way in athletics. Often this morning we've heard discussion about the problems in Division I. So I'm personally pleased that Division II is now federated and we can deregulate and we can make our own way as we move ahead in athletics.

The problems that Division I has are its problem. The professional people that run athletics departments in Division II oftentimes are overworked and overburdened with a number of issues that do not help our athletes. The statement that we need more regulations on our campus for our registrars, administration people, vice-presidents and presidents to understand athletics is absurd. They do run the athletics programs in Division II and the athletics directors of Division II speak for them.

We do not feel that certification at this time is a good step as we move toward deregulation in Division II. I'm certain in the New York area where I am from that I have very seldom read about any kinds of major — although they do occur — violations in Division II.

I really feel that Division II is an entity unto itself and to go through this certification process at this particular time is unnecessary.

**Thomas G. Pucci** (California University of Pennsylvania): When you talk about certification, it's very difficult to say you're against it. But if you would look at it, I think Division II already has a certification program. No one has really told me what is wrong with our self-study program as it stands right now. I think it's going well. I think it's productive, and I think it's very cost effective. Just last year we voted on cost-containment measures.

I think the concern that I have as an athletics administrator is the fact that we're going to have a tail wagging the dog. All these good intentions are going to create a cost that is going to be significant. That money is going to be taken away from the student-athlete and what we're actually here for—putting resources in the student-athletes for competition. This is my real concern. I'm against this proposal. I think that the self-study is productive. It's been with us awhile. People who use the self-study and really want to use it in a productive manner to better their institution and to better their athletics programs can do so. Certification is for Division I. It's a knee-jerk reaction by Division II. I think we should defeat this legislation.

**Richard Wettan** (Queens College, New York): I too rise in support of those who would like to defeat this motion. Recently in our college we have gone through a departmental review, the ISG study and an accreditation study. That is three that we have had in the last three or four years. We don't need any further mandates. We have studied enough. This is not Division I. It's time for us to reverse this "me too-

ism" where we have to do everything that Division I does.

**F. Paul Bogan** (Northeast-10 Conference): I just have a couple of questions. If this is defeated, that means we do not have the money that has already been allocated. Is that correct?

**Ms. Dorn:** We anticipate that the Administrative Committee is going to entitle the funding to the Division II membership as an Association-wide cost until the 1997 Convention.

We could defeat this motion, bring it back on the floor and I believe have funding extended to the 1997 Convention. I'm not comfortable to suggest that there would be any funding commitment after that time.

**Mr. Bogan:** But it would be the next Convention if it's defeated now and it is refined to what some of the presidents and the athletics directors would like to see. Could it be brought back and have the Association pay for it and not Division II?

**Ms. Dorn:** Yes.

**G. Ann Uhler** (Texas Woman's University): I am speaking in support of the proposal.

In my role at the university as dean of the college of health sciences, for the past six years, we have had 16 programs externally reviewed in our college. I believe in every single instance the faculty probably was not eager to launch the external review process. It is a time-consuming process and it does require great commitment. But in every single instance, I think the faculty felt that as a result of these external reviews it had made great progress in terms of looking at those kinds of things that were most important in the academic programs of the university.

I think the thing about our existing self-study process that warrants review is the fact that there is no external review. We do these and we do them well within our institutions. Then we put them in our file and we wait for someone else to inquire about it or whether we have completed this process.

That is a major failure in our process. So I am speaking in support of the proposal for the certification process for Division II. I think it is a reasonable proposal. It certainly will benefit each of our institutions. Thanks.

**Judith A. Ramaley** (Portland State University): I would like to respond to a couple of the issues that have been raised today and at other times. I've heard it said that this is not a Division II issue but a knee-jerk response to a Division I issue. I completely disagree with that point of view for several reasons. One of them is the increasing accountability being directed toward our institutions, whether public or private by regulatory agencies.

Some of you may be aware that in late November the U.S. Department of Education published a number of regulations for public disclosure of information about intercollegiate sports that will include information on gender equity, ethnic equity and graduation rates. One of the advantages of this certification program is that this information is provided with an interpretive framework. It is provided in a way that allows the general public to see that we are consistent and interested in the integrity of our intercollegiate sports programs.

So it's important to know that although it is generally not voiced,



one of the concerns about certification has been the disclosure of information about our institutions that we might find difficult to defend. In fact, that information will be disclosed by other means.

The second point I wish to make is that this is not regulation. In fact, what this is is a demonstration that we have appropriate oversight in place and provides a demonstration to the general public as well as to our campus communities and our boards that we are concerned about the student experience.

The final point I would make is that for those institutions that have had experience in linking this with accreditation, which Portland State has had, it is a very valuable way to ensure that the amount of time spent on institutional self-study in fact pays off in productive results for intercollegiate sports programs.

Although there are concerns about certification in the Northeast in particular and most people who have spoken against it are from that part of the country, we have found in speaking with conferences around the country that there is much greater support in those portions of the country where there is an opportunity for intra-institutional cooperation for oversight to be exerted through the accreditation process. Thank you.

**Joseph H. Hagan** (Assumption College): I'm speaking on behalf of this. Please don't become confused. This is not sniping at Division I in any sense whatsoever. This is trying to tie in a more professional look at certification than we have now. This will be an upgrade for us. This will help us in many, many ways. It will also help the college communities to better understand what we're doing in athletics and bring us more into the mainstream of the academic enterprise.

I think it's very important. A negative vote on this would signal the fact that we are not trying to become part of the mainstream of higher education. Thank you.

**Ralph E. Burns** (Fayetteville State University): I rise in opposition to this proposal.

I have a concern with the time and effort it takes to develop the certification documents. Many of our Division II schools have coaches and faculty who have dual responsibilities. They already are involved in self-studies for regional accreditation. Time set aside for developing this proposal would cause further strain.

I think that regional accreditation already includes some provisions for athletics that should give chief executive officers more information and understanding about their athletics programs on their campuses.

The cost is another concern. This is in direct conflict with our efforts for cost-containment. Our athletics programs are already strained in terms of cost. The passage of Proposal 7 dictates that Division II will be restricted in its effort to get additional moneys. There will be no additional moneys coming to Division II, which includes the enhancement fund. The enhancement fund does not, if it is not increased, give Division II member institutions additional moneys coming from the Association, which would further strain our budgets. I think that this particular proposal will increase the cost of operating in Division II. I urge your defeat of this proposal.

**Marjorie A. Trout** (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): I

speak in support of this motion.

I realize that all of us have many duties on our campuses and that we are concerned with the workload. But we're talking about a once-every-10-year opportunity to thoroughly review the programs and educate the campus. I hope most people who look at this understand that the purpose is not to create problems, but to identify and correct problems. Another area that is a concern is gender equity. If you have a plan in place for gender equity, that is what we would be looking for. Thank you.

**Samuel H. Rankin** (Chadron State College): I would like to speak in opposition to this proposal. Please note that Chadron State is in the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference. The last time I looked, we were not in the Northeast.

A unanimous and overwhelming majority of our conference in a poll yesterday opposed this resolution. It also was opposed in a poll conducted of the conference subsequent to the visits of representatives of the conference and the Presidents Commission last fall. I concur that certification is important and that we need to operate ethical and academically sound—and I emphasize the term—athletics programs. I think the regional accreditation is doing the job in the North Central association and other associations, and that there may be a time in the future when a certification process to validate institutional self-studies is appropriate.

The cost is more significant than has been stated, especially for institutions in Division II. The argument that leans me in the direction of negative standpoint on this at this point is that, empirically, it is not necessary. It is simply not necessary. Division II does not share the problems and burdens of Division I. If we are a federated entity at this point, we have a right, and indeed perhaps an obligation, to vote that on behalf of our athletics administrators, that we overwhelmingly operate good, clean programs. Thank you.

**James Fallis** (University of Northern Colorado): I rise in support of the certification program.

The comments by the preceding speaker are accurate in that certification is important and if it is important, then implement it. We sit in our conference meetings and we talk about how raising the official fees by \$300 to \$500 a year would be a tremendous move in the right direction to standardize some of the things that we're looking at.

I have a concern with the speaker who says that we have seen very few infractions as a result of investigations. I believe that's a weak argument. I don't think that we should be so naive to say that we don't have problems. We do have problems. Since I have been at this Convention the last couple of days, I have heard a number of people talk about things that have gone on. Questions about infractions. Why are they doing this? Who are they doing this to? What are they getting away with? Why is somebody else in another part of the country doing this, that or the other thing?

Certification is a tremendous help and it's a move in the right direction. The self-study folks—if you know how you are doing the self-study—know what the self-study does. I think most of us, if we are totally honest, spend time once every five years doing the self-study. We



look at it and say, "yeah, we have got to correct a couple of things." But it is time that we look at each other. If we have nothing to hide, then let's move forward. Let's do the right thing, let's put the certification program in place. Thank you.

**Ed Harris** (West Texas A&M University): I am opposed to the proposal and spoke against it on the floor last year.

It's somewhat a matter of cost. It's certainly a matter of time in Division II. It also gets down to a matter of what I think are wants and needs. There are certain things that we want in athletics and there are certain things that we really need.

As I look at it, we're already certifying our programs. We do have ISSG. We have association reviews. At West Texas, we are in the Southern Association. In reading Dr. Ramaley's article, they built their program into their 10-year review with their association, but I don't believe that there was a peer-review team involved there. I believe they built it in and used it. There was? Okay. I think it can be built into the Southern Association and other associations with teams that are coming in with specific questions that we would want out. I don't see that we need this new proposal.

In addition to that, the federal government and the Department of Education are now requiring more work for those of us who do it. There are many, many reviews. I believe we are recertifying our program.

**Herb F. Reinhard** (Valdosta State University): I call for the question.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

**Ms. Dorn:** We are now prepared to vote on Proposal No. 16. Prior to voting on the entire proposal, please refer to the Official Notice, page 68, Bylaw H. Because of the action that was taken at last year's Convention, the constitutionally amended bylaw now says that if we choose to have an immediate date, we must vote upon that separately from the entire proposal.

Bylaw H is requesting for the Division II certification committee to be assembled upon conclusion of this assembly. If you vote in support of H, you are voting for the immediate date for the committee to begin its work. That vote will not impact the decision of the entire proposal which we will vote upon after voting upon section H.

[Part H of Proposal No. 16 (Page A-55) was defeated, 115-131-4. Proposal No. 16 was defeated, 73-176-3.]

#### **Initial-Eligibility—Partial Qualifier—Division II**

**James Fallis** (University of Northern Colorado): I move Proposal 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 22 permits a student-athlete who is a partial qualifier to practice only on campus during the first year of attendance. This will allow those students to adjust to the university setting and reduce the emotional difficulties they may experience by being identified as a partial qualifier. In addition, it provides athletics personnel the opportunity to work with and provide guidance to the students.

It is important to note that the Academic Requirements Committee sees this as a positive incentive for academic success. I therefore urge

your adoption of Proposal 22.

**Jerry Vandergriff** (Angelo State University): I wish to support this proposal.

In 30 years of coaching, I know that the more contact we have with the athletes, the better their chance of academic success.

Over the last several years, whether or not you recruited a Prop 48, a partial qualifier or it was just a mistake in the clearinghouse that made them a partial qualifier later on, we have lost several recruits, basically because we could not have any contact with them at that point. I urge your support of this proposal.

**Todd W. Henne** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Edinboro University of Pennsylvania): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is strongly opposed to Proposal 22. If passed, the consequence of being a partial qualifier will only amount to an automatic red shirt year because Division II partial qualifiers, unlike their Division I counterparts, already receive their fourth season of eligibility. We feel this proposal sends the wrong message to partial qualifiers and high-school athletes. Partial qualifiers must learn that academics are the first priority at college. Too often student-athletes prioritize athletics over academics. The best way to guard against this is to eliminate the athletics aspect until it has been earned.

Let us keep in mind the challenge given to the NCAA by Mr. Lyons at the honors dinner to keep education as the primary goal. The student-athletes urge your opposition to Proposal 22.

**Raymond L. Orbach** (University of California, Riverside): I speak in opposition to Proposal 22. Partial qualifiers need their full attention devoted to do their academic programs. Participation and practice will divert from that.

**Mr. Fallis:** I want to remind the body that this is permissive legislation. You do not have to require it. With all due respect to the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and the outstanding academic background that those individuals have, our student-athlete advisory committee at the University of Northern Colorado supported this piece of legislation.

**Greg Waggoner** (Western State College of Colorado): I stand in support of adoption of this legislation.

After 15 years of coaching, it is very apparent to me that all research indicates that the identification with an institution or a membership in a club on campus, be it intercollegiate athletics or otherwise, is highly related to retention and to the average student's eventual success.

Their regimented daily task of being in contact with and under the supervision of coaches and being held accountable to that team, as well as to the identification with that membership, is imperative to the success for this type of student. I move that this body pass this legislation.

**Diane Husic** (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): As a faculty athletics representative, I must agree with the comments from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

I would also like to point out that many Division II institutions cannot financially support recruited partial qualifiers who cannot partici-



pate for a year. I also prefer doing this because I would like to remind you of the difference between the definition of the partial qualifier. In Division II, it's a much smaller standard. I also think the students should spend their first year if they are a partial qualifier focusing on academics.

**Andrew Hinson** (Cheyney University of Pennsylvania): I speak in support of Proposal No. 22. Those of you who really have been into coaching know that—and I have been in this thing over 40-some odd years—the one person who at any time is held responsible for a parent's offspring is the guy who came to the house and said, "I would like to have your son or daughter attend our institution." I think it's unfair for the coach to not have the opportunity to give guidance to these young people. I think you will notice that it will increase our retention because these young people will be involved. I don't believe going to practice for an hour or so a day is going to send that young person to the library. So I speak in support of Proposal No. 22.

[Proposal No. 22 (Page A-79) was adopted, 180-68-1.]

#### **Two-Year College Transfers—Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier—Division II**

**David O'Toole** (Bellarmine College): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee of the NCAA Council and the Division II subcommittee of the Presidents Commission, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal addresses concerns related to the academic preparation of partial qualifiers or nonqualifiers who transfer to Division II institutions from two-year colleges. The proposal would require a two-year college transfer student who is not a qualifier and who has not graduated from the two-year college to have completed successfully an average of at least 12 semesters or quarter hours of transferable degree credit for each semester/quarter or full-time attendance on the two-year college in order to fulfill transfer-eligibility requirements.

Under current legislation, a two-year college transfer may fulfill transfer-eligibility requirements by successfully completing a minimum of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 regardless of the number of full-time semesters or quarters of attendance at the two-year college. Thus, a student literally could attend a two-year college for two full academic years and be eligible upon transfer to a Division II institution, provided he or she completes six hours of transferable degree credit for each term at the two-year college.

Comparably, a student-athlete who enrolls initially in a Division II institution must successfully complete 12 hours per term to satisfy necessary satisfactory-progress requirements. It is the steering committee's position that those individuals who satisfy this Division II initial-eligibility standard upon graduation from high school generally earned the necessary hours at a two-year college to ensure progress toward the four-year degree upon transfer to a Division II institution.

This proposal, by increasing the minimum number of necessary transferable degree credit hours for nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers to transfer from the two-year college to a Division II institution,

will help ensure those students' academic success at the Division II institution.

On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I urge your support for Proposal No. 26.

**Jerry Vandergriff** (Angelo State University): Just a point of clarification on this. Most of these partial qualifiers coming out are going to be required to take developmental or remedial courses. As a result, these will not transfer as transferable degree hours. Therefore, it's going to be very, very difficult for them in normal matriculation for a Division II institution in three semesters to be able to average 12 hours of transferable degree credit. With this legislation, are we inadvertently or unknowingly slamming the door on them because they are being required to take developmental courses that will not transfer?

**Judith A. Ramaley** (Portland State University): I'm the chair of the Division II Presidents Commission Subcommittee. On behalf of the Division II subcommittee, I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 26.

For the past year and a half, the subcommittee has been reviewing academic issues related to student-athletes; in particular, concerns about students transferring from two-year colleges. These concerns relate to the lack of self-academic preparation and the low graduation rates that we have begun to detect among students who transfer to our Division II institutions from two-year colleges.

Last year, we had a number of proposals at the Convention related to this issue and the result was that we passed Proposal No. 68, which called for a study of the experience of transfer students and the development of a package of legislation in support of sound academic program experience.

Some of these concerns are addressed in Proposal 26. As Mr. O'Toole has explained, the current standards do not necessarily ensure that transfer student-athletes who have an academically sound experience are on track to graduate when they enter a Division II institution.

I would like to mention that the NCAA research staff is currently compiling additional data in this area as it relates specifically to Division II transfers. The subcommittee of the Presidents Commission will continue to study additional packages of legislation with the Council that might ensure that student-athletes have good experience in the transfer process. Thank you.

**William Helman** (Metropolitan State College of Denver): I want to speak against Proposal 26. Although I can support stronger transfer requirements, I feel that this proposal creates an uneven playing field. Certain institutions will achieve an advantage based just upon how they accept or reject transfer credits.

For instance, a transfer who passed an average of 15 credit hours may have all 15 hours accepted in one institution and only 10 accepted per semester at another institution. I think this legislation would be a lot more equitable and acceptable if it combined requirements for overall hours passed as well as a minimum number of transferable credit hours in combination.

I urge you to defeat this proposal.

**Stan Aldridge** (Georgia College): I'd like to speak in opposition to



this proposal.

First of all, I don't think that we have the same standards for qualifiers and nonqualifiers that transfer from junior colleges. Qualifiers can still transfer with 24 transferable hours, which would be six per semester, where the nonqualifier or the partial qualifier would have to have 48 hours or 12 per semester.

Developmental studies is a big thing. If a nonqualifier goes into a developmental studies program and stays for two terms, then it's almost impossible for them to ever achieve a 12-hour-per-term average.

I think that the junior college transfer is probably our biggest satisfactory-progress problem that we face today in the NCAA. But I think this is the wrong approach. I think we need to look at core curriculum and core-curriculum requirements rather than just hours per term.

**Robert N. Evers** (New Mexico Highlands University): I would like to support this proposal. My comment is about the uneven field as far as accepting transfer hours. All of our institutions are different. They are all going to evaluate transcripts differently on the number of hours that will be accepted in transferring to degree programs specifically at that institution. This legislation will not change that from the existing regulations in the NCAA. Thank you.

**Ralph Barkey** (Sonoma State University): I need some help in clarification of this. Could the sponsors of this proposal help us understand who is getting hurt or helped by this? As I understand this, it is not applicable to a student who never goes full time to a two-year institution or perhaps goes part time for four consecutive semesters and has 10 or 11 units per semester. It says "average of 12 of full-time attendance." Therefore, is that student who goes four terms and has 40 transferable units not eligible?

**Ms. Dorn:** The student-athlete would not be defined as transferable under those conditions. They were never a full-time student.

**Mr. Barkey:** Even though they satisfied the 24 unit and 2.0? He has 40 units of 3.6 work and because he's never been a full-time student, because of part-time work, he's not?

**Ms. Dorn:** My significant other is going to answer that for us.

**Stephen A. Mallonee** (NCAA): Ralph, what she's saying is that because that individual would not trigger being a transfer student, that person's eligibility would be certified under the initial-eligibility standards, not the transfer-eligibility standards.

**Mr. Barkey:** Tell me why it doesn't trigger the transfer. It is because they've never been a full-time student at a junior college?

**Mr. Mallonee:** Exactly.

**Mr. Barkey:** Is it right now that they must attend two terms?

**Mr. Mallonee:** Well, right now once you are a transfer. Once you are enrolled full time at a two-year college, one of the requirements of meeting transfer eligibility in Division II is you must spend at least two full terms or two full semesters or three quarters excluding the summer. If you have never been a full-time student, you wouldn't have triggered your status as a transfer, you would be entering fresh.

**Mr. Barkey:** I see.

[Proposal No. 26 (Page A-88) was adopted, 172-74.]

## Resolution: Financial Aid in Division II

**Kurt L. Patberg** (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Resolution No. 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

With the passage of Proposal No. 7, it has been indicated that financial aid will be studied. This is a way for us to send a signal—a greater signal—that this is an important issue for Division II, that studying financial aid is something that needs to be done. It is a Division II issue that needs to be studied by Division II people. We don't feel it has been done so in many years. We ask your support. Thank you.

[Resolution No. 29 (Page A-92) was adopted, 192-52.]

**Ms. Dorn:** We have concluded all items on the Presidential Agenda Day. Does anyone wish to reconsider any items that have been acted upon? You will also have one more opportunity to reconsider these items this afternoon at the general business session. Seeing no one at the mike, we are now prepared to depart and move to Proposal No. 43. We will now be able to use the paddles for the remaining proposals.

## De Minimis Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes

**Carol M. Dunn** (California State University, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Eligibility Committee and Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to stop affecting a prospect's or student-athlete's eligibility when an institutional official violates one of these pieces of legislation.

Violations of this legislation do not result in a benefit being provided to the prospect or the student-athlete and the institution seldom gains a recruiting or competitive advantage. It is important to note, however, that all violations of NCAA rules, including those in this proposal, must be reported to the NCAA. One or more of the penalties outlined in Bylaw 19.6.1 will continue to be imposed upon the institution and institutional employees.

The only difference is that it won't affect the eligibility of innocent prospects or student-athletes. In your program, page two of the revisions to the Official Notice, please note there is a correction in letter "J" of this proposal. The modification to this legislation should indicate that when a prospect's official visit extends beyond the 48-hour limitation due to inclement weather, the violation does not affect the prospect's eligibility.

The Eligibility Committee believes this proposal is an effective and positive step toward deregulation of de minimis violations that currently affect a prospect's or student-athlete's eligibility. The Eligibility Committee and Council strongly support this proposal. I urge your support as well. Thank you.

[Parts A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H and J of Proposal No. 43 (Page A-126) were adopted.]

## Expenses—Travel to Regular-Season Contests

### During Vacation Period—Divisions I and II

**Carol M. Dunn** (California State University, Los Angeles): On be-



half of the Division II Steering Committee of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal addresses expenses related to travel to regular-season contests during the vacation period.

Under current NCAA regulations, the student-athlete is required to pay the equivalent of a round-trip ticket to his or her home when traveling home during vacation in conjunction with an away-from-home regular-season contest. This would occur even if the team itinerary includes a stop in the student-athlete's home city at no additional expense to the institution.

The current rule, in effect, can require students to subsidize team travel if a student remains home following the conclusion of the event. This proposal would allow an institution to provide the cost of round-trip transportation for the student-athlete, to travel from campus to the event site and back to campus, even if the student-athlete did not travel with the team. If the student-athlete travels to a site other than the event site during a vacation period, the student-athlete would only pay the additional costs associated with travel to that site.

I urge your support of Proposal No. 49.

[Proposal No. 49 (Page A-131) was adopted.]

#### Promotional Activities

**Shirley Green Reese** (Albany State College, Georgia): On behalf of the NCAA Council and Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 133.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is the result of the Legislative Review Committee's review of Bylaw 16 to identify areas in which the rules could be deregulated.

It identified the effect on the eligibility of a student-athlete who wins a prize in an activity that utilizes athletics ability. In the committee's opinion, a student-athlete who is selected at random to participate in a contest in which athletics ability is used to win a prize, should not become ineligible if he or she wins. Accordingly, the committee recommended that the Council sponsor this legislation. In order to not affect eligibility, the contest must be open to the general public or student body in general. As noted in the rationale, it is anticipated that an institution could be trusted not to "set up" such a contest as a means of providing benefits to the student-athletes. I urge you to join the Council in supporting this legislation.

[Proposal No. 133 (Page A-251) was adopted.]

#### Financial Aid—Equivalency Figure for Books

**Christ Petrouleas** (Wayne State University, Michigan): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of this proposal would increase from \$200 to \$400 the equivalent value utilized for books in determining compliance with institutional financial aid limitations for each sport.

The committee submits this proposal to the membership as a result

of its need-based aid study. While this proposal is not part of the proposed legislation, the committee did note during its financial aid survey of Divisions I and II institutions that the current \$200 figure is in no way indicative of the actual dollars expended for books. The committee is aware that the equivalency figure for a particular student-athlete may be affected by such an adjustment, but the results should be inconsequential across an entire sports team.

The Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism urge the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

**Terry Wanless** (University of North Dakota): Usually, we don't speak against moneys allocated toward student-athletes, but in Division II we have a limited number of full scholarships. We are not really adding to the student-athlete, we are simply adding to the equivalency base. We're providing an opportunity to scholarship more student-athletes without enhancing the purpose behind which I think the legislation was intended.

I suggest that we vote this down. It's cost enhancing and does not provide what I really think we wanted it to do—provide additional help to the student-athlete.

[Proposal No. 52 (Page A-134) was adopted.]

#### Financial Aid—Multiple-Sport Participants—Division II

**Richard M. Dull** (University of Nebraska at Kearney): On behalf of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference, I respectfully move Proposal No. 55.

The intent of this legislation will allow a multiple-sport student-athlete to participate in the sport of football without having to be counted against the institution's scholarship limits until the student-athlete actually participates in competition.

In effect, this would allow him to practice and not be counted against the institutional limits until he actually plays. Present regulations do not allow for this latitude. This proposal is student-athlete friendly. It would enhance and promote multisport participation. On behalf of our conference, I would urge its passage.

**Robert L. Heiny** (University of Northern Colorado): On behalf of the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I'd like to make the following statements concerning Proposal No. 55.

While the committee did not take any position on this proposal, it did recommend that the sponsor include a reference to a previous NCAA Council group interpretation. Specifically, the Division I membership adopted this identical proposal last year in San Diego. After the Convention, the NCAA Interpretations Committee issued a standard on March 16, 1995, that clarified that this exception is only available to the true multisport participant who was not recruited and/or was not offered financial aid to participate in the sport of football. The committee has suggested that this same standard be applicable to Division II should we adopt this legislation.

I would like to recommend that the Division II Steering Committee issue such an interpretation during its post-Convention meeting. Thank you.

**Ms. Dorn:** The sponsors have acknowledged that this is their intent. Thank you. Any other discussion?



[Proposal No. 55 (Page A-137) was adopted.]

**Eligibility for Practice—Minimum Full-Time Enrollment—United States Olympic Committee/National Governing Body Waiver**  
**Theodore S. Paulauskas** (St. Anselm College): I move the adoption of Proposal 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Ms. Dorn:** At this time, we'd like to vote upon the immediate date. We'll vote on the immediate date first. We want to be sure that people understand that the immediate date may have an impact upon the presentation or the support of the proposal

[The immediate effective date of Proposal No. 56 (Page A-138) was adopted.]

**Mr. Paulauskas:** This proposal will permit a student-athlete with eligibility remaining who is not enrolled or is enrolled in less than a full-time program of studies or a former student-athlete to practice with an institution's team, provided the individual's participation is recommended by the United States Olympic Committee of the national governing body. The practice takes place only at the institution(s) that the individual previously attended. Participation involves an individual sport, or the sport of crew or synchronized swimming. The individual does not participate in any coaching activities; and, in the case of the student-athlete with eligibility remaining, participation occurs during the academic year immediately preceding the Olympic Games.

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-138) was adopted.]

**Eligibility—Seasons of Competition—Tennis**

**Karen L. Miller** (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): On behalf of the Intercollegiate Tennis Association, I move Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this proposal is due to a recent survey taken by the ITA coaching members.

The legislation eliminates some of the existing inequities they feel that are in college tennis and encourages student-athletes to matriculate in a timely manner and discourages semiprofessional (or professional) participation.

I urge your support of this proposal.

**Jeff Frank** (Intercollegiate Tennis Association): I represent the ITA, which is the governing body of collegiate tennis.

Proposal 57 is really a unique proposal in that coaches are not asking for concessions, but rather seeking to further restrict ourselves. We are actually requesting your help in helping us by addressing these abuses so that we can ensure legitimate academic integrity and a level playing field and reinforce the concept of amateurism, which is a problem for collegiate tennis.

Because of some misunderstanding, please note that Proposal 57 does not discriminate against international students. It applies to American student-athletes also. It does not affect available scholarships for either of these bodies. It basically states that there will be a one-year grace period after graduation from high school. If a student-athlete enters school at that time, he's immediately eligible and has a

four-year eligibility. If he stays out more than one year for each year that he plays on the circuit, he will lose one year of eligibility. When he enters college, he'll have to sit out for a year to become eligible.

To give you some illustrations of why these abuses need to be addressed, players who play all over the world now for three, four, or five years are able to enter college tennis. We often have a mid-20-year-old student playing against an 18-year-old legitimate freshman. This obviously is not a level playing field.

Secondly, players who drop off the tour—and this often happens in January when there are not tournaments being offered—can enter an institution for a year, or even part of a semester, and play intercollegiately, attending some classes—or not attending some classes—and dropping out of school either at the end of the conference tournament or the NCAA tournament without even trying to complete a semester.

As an Association, we have discussed this for five years. The members are very much behind this. The Divisions I and II coaches voted overwhelmingly. Over two-thirds of our membership support this. Passage of this proposal would create a more level playing field and solve current amateurism problems, since the investigation and confirmation of international students' eligibility is often so difficult for the NCAA to determine. It emphasizes that intercollegiate athletics includes academics and that the student-athletes should be committed to legitimate educational processes.

**Thomas G. Pucci** (California University of Pennsylvania): I would like to remind the membership that last year we had similar legislation that was proposed in track. We talked about it a great deal. We went ahead and voted for it and we came back to reconsider this.

If we pass this legislation, we're taking a completely different philosophy than what Division II is about. Right now on my women's tennis team we have two young ladies who are 24 or 25 years old. They are not on scholarship, but have come back. One of them is married and has two children. Don't we want to give those people the opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics in Division II? The window is closed in Division I for that individual. The person can only go to Division II.

I think we've got to really understand the philosophy of Division II. We have the 10-semester rule and all the things we have implemented throughout the years to give those older students an opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics. If we pass this in tennis, we open the door for football, basketball and what-have-you.

I really want the membership to consider if they pass this legislation what they are doing as far as the philosophy of Division II is concerned. Thank you.

**Richard F. Haitbrink** (United States Tennis Association): I'm representing the United States Tennis Association. The USTA is the national governing body of the sport of tennis in the United States.

The USTA strongly supports and encourages the young men and women who have participated in USTA junior tennis programs to take advantage of the college educational experience without undue delay, rather than to drift along for a period of one to three or more years, testing and building their tennis skills on the professional tennis cir-



culits before they actually decide to enter college.

The USTA is concerned about college tennis and about the thousands of junior tennis players in the United States who are looking forward to a college educational and tennis experience. The current eligibility requirements permit certain inequities in tennis. A primary one has just been discussed. In many instances, college tennis players are faced with competing against other young men and women, both from the United States and from other countries, who are several years older and who have been competing in professional tennis circuits all over the world for a period of one to six years.

Proposal 57 will eliminate this inequity. It would, in effect, level the playing field. It would create fair and competitive opportunities for all college tennis players, including those thousands of young men and women who have grown up through the USTA junior tennis system and who wish to participate in the college educational and tennis experience. The adoption of Proposal 57 will also greatly diminish the current difficulty we have in monitoring the abuses of amateur status as we know it in the United States and under current USTA and NCAA rules.

There currently is no way to adequately monitor the payment of funds, either as expense money or as prize money, to tennis players, including American players who compete in professional tournaments outside the United States. The practical effect of adopting Proposal 57 would be to minimize the abuses that do occur in this area.

In closing, I'd like to say that the president and CEO of the USTA, Lester M. Snyder Jr., who is a faculty member at an NCAA member institution and on the board of directors of the USTA, strongly supports the adoption of this proposal. We have communicated this support to the presidents, faculty athletics representatives and the athletics directors of all NCAA member institutions. Thank you.

**James Fallis** (University of Northern Colorado): In reference to the speaker once removed with the 24-year-old housewife who has children. I don't think we are compromising our principle. If this individual had been out of school since her high-school days, comes back to the institution at the age of 24 and has not been enrolled full-time, this individual does have 10 semesters and will have four seasons of competition, if I understand this legislation right. I urge your adoption.

**Kelly J. Higgins** (University of Alaska Fairbanks): I wholeheartedly concur with Jim's assessment that the individual will have that eligibility remaining. But once the door has been closed in one sport, I firmly believe that eventually you start closing the doors in the other sports to those individuals who wish to participate. This year, I have a freshman on our rifle team who worked his entire lifetime in the military and has come back to school with a family and children. He is very good. I want that individual to have that opportunity in the future. I urge you to defeat this proposal. Thank you.

**Ralph E. Burns** (Fayetteville State University): A point of clarification, does this piece of legislation include only those individuals who have participated on an organized circuit or does it include individuals who have been out for two years? It does not speak to the organized circuit, but many of the speakers before me made reference to that. I

think that is confusing in this legislation, so I'm asking the membership to understand exactly what the intent of this legislation is.

**Stephen A. Mallonee** (NCAA): That's a good question. I'm referencing the proposal and the comments made by Jeff Frank. Basically, it indicates that you are charged with a season of tennis eligibility for each calendar year subsequent to graduation from high school, or the international equivalent, and prior to full-time collegiate enrollment during which the athlete participated in organized tennis events.

**Mr. Burns:** That's correct.

**Mr. Mallonee:** So once you graduate then after the calendar year has elapsed, you would be looking at each calendar year subsequent to graduation from high school to see if you participated in organized competition—and that's not just circuits; that could be recreational tournaments and organized events. You would lose a season for each calendar year.

**Mr. Frank:** If I could also clarify, all the waiver situations that now exist in the NCAA, particularly with regard to the military, are still in effect. We assumed there would be a waiver opportunity with this proposal.

**Wallace Jackson** (Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): You know, it looks as though we're serving the same wine in different glasses with the proposal coming from last year.

I think two points need to be looked at. One is the nontraditional student. Two, the percentage of normal students who depend on federal funds. Looking at the recent congressional administration, it's going to be tough. Rather than come in with an ill-fated proposal, our coaches need to look at better recruitment in a nonrevenue sport. I would urge the entire body to defeat this legislation.

**Sharon E. Taylor** (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): First of all, there are waiver procedures. But if this is passed and so many prospective student-athletes are disadvantaged, the institutions have to go through a waiver procedure for every kid who was out of school for two years then comes back in and has played in a recreational tennis tournament somewhere in town or an organized tennis tournament. That's an incredible burden on institutions. I think that if the coaches are truly serious about wanting to take care of this situation, they can do it themselves. Bringing it back to the Association and asking for a whole group of people to be exempted from participation is not the direction to go.

We're going to be legislating separate rules on a sport-by-sport basis in every sport we have in the Association if we continue down this road.

**Mr. Burns:** I am in agreement with the previous speaker. This piece of legislation has implications for other sports as well. Am I to understand that a person who plays golf, stays out of school for two years and participates in a local golf tournament will then lose a year of eligibility? Does the same thing happen with recreational softball? I'm saying that the implications for this legislation are far-reaching. I urge your defeat of this piece of legislation.

**Mr. Pucci:** The real concern that I have is for our walk-on program that many of us have in tennis. The real concern I have is the individ-



ual like the 23-year old woman who plays recreational tennis and is in a "C" or "D" division in team tennis in the summer. That individual will no longer be able to compete at a university.

This is the problem with this legislation. I again bring back the philosophy of Division II, which is so important. I think that we should defeat this legislation.

**John A. Hogan** (Colorado School of Mines): Some of you can remember the long debate and fight 10 years ago that Divisions II and III sponsored to eliminate the five-year rule. Some of you remember how long we had to fight to get Division I to agree with us to eliminate the five-year rule and then allowed them to put it back in. That was one way in which Division II established an identity. We don't have the five-year rule and Division I does.

This is penalizing innocent students who have no idea that they're losing eligibility because they play in the city park tennis tournament or a golf tournament simply because it's organized. I think this is very bad legislation. It is comparing recreational tennis players and golfers with professional tennis players and golfers. I understand their dilemma, but that has to do with professional, high-powered athletes as opposed to recreational people who end up going on to college later on in life and say, "I'd like to run cross country." I had a kid come to me who wanted to run cross country. Same problem. You couldn't do it because of the five-year rule. We got rid of that. This is very similar. I move that we refer this to committee, have them rewrite it and clarify a difference between professional and recreational athletes. I so move.

[The motion was seconded.]

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 57 (Page A-140) was defeated, 111-133-2.]

**Diane Husic** (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): I find it ironic that we talk about student-athlete welfare, opportunities and diversity. We have a proposal that can dramatically impact the opportunity of another growing group on our campuses—the nontraditional student. I don't think we should eliminate the potential for this class of students on our campuses. I urge the defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 57 (Page A-140) was defeated.]

#### **Core-Curriculum Requirements—Eighth-Grade Courses**

**Diane Husic** (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Council and the Academic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 60.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation permits the use of an eighth-grade course to meet core-curriculum requirements, provided the eighth-grade course is considered by the high school to be equivalent to one of the high-school core courses. That provision was adopted prior to the establishment of a Council subcommittee on initial-eligibility waivers. As we know, some times high schools do not fully understand how our core-course requirements and definitions apply to their own courses, let alone eighth-grade course work.

The legislation is fairly straightforward when you are dealing with a course like algebra I, but it can be much more complicated with other eighth-grade courses. The Academic Requirements Committee and the

Council believe that the waiver committee and its staff should review these individual cases to be sure that the eighth-grade core course in question does in fact meet the NCAA core-course requirement.

If the course is found to be equivalent and an accepted core course at that high school, then the course can be added to the clearinghouse file and approved for subsequent students who attend that high school and take that eighth-grade course.

I urge you to adopt this proposal.

**Alan H. Patterson** (Carolinas-Virginia Athletic Conference): I speak in opposition to this proposal.

The proposal to allow the use of eighth-grade courses to satisfy core courses is well-intentioned, but ill-advised for two reasons. First, this proposal discourages motivated students from taking advanced courses, particularly algebra in the eighth grade. Instead of accepting the challenge to take an accelerated middle school program, students will remain in prealgebra and other water-downed courses. Those who have already taken algebra in the eighth grade will be encouraged to repeat the course in the ninth grade, coasting to an easy grade.

The NCAA should stand for academic excellence. The proposal discourages middle schools from offering advanced, accelerated courses and discourages qualified students from taking such courses if offered.

Secondly, this proposal has no phase-in period for those who have taken or are taking algebra in the eighth grade. This is of particular concern with seniors who are currently right on track for meeting freshman eligibility requirements and who may wake up tomorrow, read the newspapers and find that they are missing a required math course. This would contradict the guide provided for high-school students by the NCAA itself and could result in litigation. To say that the students may apply for a waiver is hardly satisfactory.

When a coach receives a weekly status report and reads that a prospective student-athlete is missing a required core course, the coach will not normally think in terms of waivers. He will tend to direct recruiting efforts and grant-in-aid moneys to other prospects—prospects who may be less motivated and less academically qualified.

I respectfully suggest that the NCAA membership votes "no" on Proposal 60 so the NCAA Council can further study its full ramifications.

[Proposal No. 60 (Page A-143) was adopted.]

#### **Participation Prior to Initial-Eligibility Certification— Nonrecruited Student-Athletes—Women's Crew**

**Rita M. Castagna** (Assumption College): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee of the NCAA Council, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would extend the temporary initial-eligibility certification period for student-athletes participating in the sport of women's crew by permitting a nonrecruited student to practice, but not compete, throughout the nontraditional season in that sport.

Women's crew generally does not enjoy the same widespread level of participation on the high-school level found in other sports. The vast majority of crew participants at the collegiate level are students who



have no crew background whatsoever and in some cases have no experience in any sport. Most rowers are walk-ons who are recruited on campus after initial collegiate enrollment. Often it takes an inordinate amount of time to teach the basic fundamentals to these prospects, and it takes additional time to convince more promising individuals to stay with the program. When you get up at 4:30 or 5 o'clock in the morning, you can understand that one.

It is therefore important to allow as much time as possible to expose students to the sport and to encourage their continued participation. Thus, the Council believes that it is important to support the sports-specific exception to the temporary recertification period.

Please note that the time period would relate only to the institution's nontraditional season and would not result in a competitive advantage for any institution inasmuch as the student-athlete would not be eligible to compete until certified by the NCAA initial-eligibility clearinghouse. I urge your support for Proposal No. 61.

**Diane Husic** (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee, I speak in opposition to Proposal 61.

This certainly should not be considered an indictment against women's crew. We are all encouraged by the prospect that there will be an increased opportunity for young women. We long for the time when women's crew will be recognized as an established sport; however, our concerns are as follows: Number one, we are concerned that this proposal will permit student-athletes to participate who do not meet our initial-eligibility standards. The purpose of our initial-eligibility standards is in large part to help identify those students who may have difficulty during their initial year of enrollment. This is for women's crew participants as well. Number two, we have a current rule that permits these nonrecruits to practice for 45 days. Isn't this sufficient? How does extending the 45-day period before the students' initial eligibility needs to be determined help keep more students interested in women's crew? Three, we do not believe it is appropriate to single out specific sports to exempt from our initial-eligibility standards. We find strength in the fact that our standards apply to all sports. Moreover, what do we tell other sports that may believe they do not share in a widespread support similar to women's crew? Therefore, I encourage you to defeat Proposal No. 61.

[Proposal No. 61 (Page A-144) was defeated.]

#### **Satisfactory Progress—Calculation of Grade-Point Average— Division II**

**Mary Lisko** (Augusta College): On behalf of the Peach Belt Athletic Conference, I move Proposal No. 62.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal recommends that the GPA calculation required for student-athletes in Division II be based only on all grades earned at the certifying institution. It removes the need to earn the requisite grade-point average in all grades earned in all institutions. The current rule requires the certifying institution to include for grade-point average purposes all grades from courses taken at all previous institutions even when those courses were not transferred or transferable.

It also requires the certifying institution to return to a transfer student's transcript each subsequent year to determine whether or not the student will be eligible, even when he or she has made satisfactory progress at the certifying institution.

This proposal would not alter the requirements for the immediate eligibility of a transfer student. It would instead simplify the certification process in subsequent years by eliminating the need for a second grade-point average calculation that has been complicated and confusing. Both the Academic Requirements Committee and the faculty representatives association support this proposal. I urge your support as well. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 62 (Page A-145) was adopted.]

#### **Satisfactory Progress—Additional Waivers**

**Marjorie A. Trout** (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will authorize the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee to treat all satisfactory-progress waivers that currently are being treated by the NCAA Administrative Review Panel.

Adopting this proposal would ensure that those who have the most expertise in this area will be reviewing these cases. Additionally, the adoption of this proposal will streamline this waiver process and ensure that cases are resolved more quickly. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 64.

[Proposal No. 64 (Page A-146) was adopted.]

#### **Graduate Student—One-Time Transfer Exception**

**Denise O'Grady** (University of Northern Colorado): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under current legislation, a student who has not received his or her bachelor's degree may transfer from one four-year institution to another four-year institution and be immediately eligible to compete if he or she meets the requirements of the one-time transfer exception. However, a student who excels academically and who has received a bachelor's degree prior to exhausting his or her intercollegiate athletics ability, cannot transfer to a different four-year institution and utilize the one-time transfer exception. Instead, the student must decide between transferring before receiving his or her bachelor's degree or transferring after receiving a degree and giving up his or her remaining eligibility.

Student-athletes who excel academically should not be penalized. A student often must transfer to a different institution in order to enter a particular graduate program and it is not fair that he or she must give up any remaining eligibility while students who have not yet received a bachelor's degree can transfer at will.

Concerns have been expressed that this legislation will open the door to creating a four-year prospect. However, the same safeguards that are currently in place for utilizing the one-time transfer exception will be there under this legislation. Releases will have to be obtained to contact the student regarding transfer and to utilize the one-time



transfer exception. In addition, this exception is not available in the sports of Division I-A football, Division I basketball and Division I ice hockey, the sports where recruiting is most likely to occur.

I urge you to pass this legislation in the interest of fairness to student-athletes who complete their degree program and desire to continue pursuing an education.

[Proposal No. 65 (Page A-147) was adopted.]

#### **Subvarsity Eligibility—Division II**

**Timothy J. Dillon** (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 66.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would specify that a transfer student from either a two-year or four-year college who was not a qualifier and who has not met necessary transfer-eligibility requirements shall not be eligible for subvarsity competition during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution.

Under current legislation, a two-year college transfer who was not a qualifier upon graduation from high school and who has not met the two-year college transfer requirements applicable to nonqualifiers, is eligible to compete at the subvarsity level at a Division II institution. Further, a transfer student from a four-year institution who was not a qualifier is eligible to compete immediately at the subvarsity level at a Division II institution even if the individual has not completed an academic year in residence at the previous institution.

Current legislation, however, precludes transfer students who are not qualifiers and who have not met applicable transfer-eligibility requirements from engaging in practice and competition as a member of the varsity team during their first academic year in residence by the Division II institution. The steering committee believes that permitting transfers who are not qualifiers and who have not satisfied necessary transfer-eligibility requirements to compete at the subvarsity level is inconsistent with the general principle that such students must fulfill an academic year in residence prior to representing the certifying institution in intercollegiate athletics.

The steering committee realizes that the proposal does not preclude transfer students who are not qualifiers from practicing with an institution's subvarsity team. However, the steering committee believes that it would not be permissible for such transfer students to engage in joint practice sessions with the institution's varsity team.

On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I urge your support for Proposal No. 66. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 66 (Page A-148) was adopted (with immediate effective date).]

#### **"4-2-4" Transfer Eligibility—Two-Year Nonparticipation Exception**

**Denise O'Grady** (University of Northern Colorado): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 67.

[The motion was seconded.]

The "4-2-4" transfer rules exist to prevent a student-athlete who is experiencing academic difficulties from transferring to a two-year col-

lege then to a different four-year school and avoid satisfactory-progress rules. However, there are many situations in which a student leaves a four-year institution for reasons that are unrelated to athletics. Often a student must return home because of financial, medical or family circumstances beyond his or her control. The student enrolls full-time at a local two-year college in order to continue pursuing an education, unaware of the effect that can have on future intercollegiate athletics eligibility.

If the student is subsequently able to attend a different four-year institution but has not graduated from the two-year college, he or she must complete a calendar year of residency before being eligible to compete. A two-year nonparticipation exception currently exists for "4-2-4" transfers that allows the student to start with a clean academic slate. If a 4-2-4 transfer student has not competed in intercollegiate athletics for a period of at least two years, no competitive advantage is gained by allowing the student to be immediately eligible.

[Proposal No. 67 (Page A-149) was adopted.]

#### **Playing and Practice Seasons—Divisions I and II Tennis**

**Thomas J. Brown** (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 71 on behalf of the conference.

[The motion was seconded.]

A year ago when we proposed the legislation for the nontraditional segments, we did not take into consideration those schools or those conferences that play their traditional segment in tennis in the fall. This proposal allows practice to begin August 24 or the first day of classes and for competition to begin September 1 or the preceding Friday.

In some of our areas, those two weeks make a very important difference to getting the schedule in before inclement weather.

**Rita M. Castagna** (Assumption College): On behalf of the Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons, I urge your support of Proposal No. 71. This proposal will permit an institution that conducts its traditional segment in the sport of tennis during the fall to commence practice sessions August 24 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever occurs first. In addition, an institution would be permitted to engage in its first date of competition in the sport of tennis September 1 or preceding Friday if September 1 falls on Saturday or Sunday.

I urge your support for Proposal No. 71.

[Proposal No. 71 (Page A-171) was adopted.]

#### **First Contest Date and Contest Exemptions—Division II Basketball**

**Jack F. Doyle** (University of South Dakota): As a member of the basketball committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 75.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal was developed to promote a Division II collegiate basketball playoff through the promotion of the Tip-Off Classic prior to the start of each basketball season. The goal is to provide representation from each of the eight regions on a rotation basis. Further, it should be noted that the classic would be sponsored and would not result in any significant expenditure to member institutions.



I urge the passage of Proposal 75.

**Willie G. Shaw** (Morehouse College): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, I urge you to support Proposal 75.

In addition to what the previous speaker just said, all revenues generated from the Tip-Off Classic then would be distributed to nonprofit or charitable organizations after expenses. Finally, the Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons supports this proposal. Again, I urge you to support Proposal No. 75.

[Proposal No. 75 (Page A-177) was adopted.]

#### **Contest Exemptions—Softball**

**Theodore S. Paulauskas** (St. Anselm College): I move adoption of Proposal No. 77.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I urge your support of Proposal No. 77. If adopted, this proposal will permit an institution's softball team to exempt annually one contest played against the U.S. national softball team, which is consistent with the exemption that currently exists in ice hockey for the U.S. Olympic team. The Amateur Softball Association has indicated that such competition with an institution's team will increase the quality of players not only at the national team level but also at the collegiate level. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 77 (Page A-179) was adopted.]

#### **Playing and Practice Seasons—First Contest Date— Divisions I and II Football**

**Robert T. Becker** (Saginaw Valley State University): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 79.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would change the first permissible contest date in football to the Thursday preceding Labor Day. Under the current legislation, the first permissible contest date is September 1 or the preceding Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday.

Allowing the first contest to be played on the Thursday before Labor Day is a more consistent standard that does not fluctuate with the calendar. The Council adopted noncontroversial legislation to effectuate this change in 1995-96. This legislation would simply extend the change to future use.

[Proposal No. 79 (Page A-181) was adopted.]

#### **Playing and Practice Seasons—Annual Exemptions— Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse and Softball**

**Robert E. Hartwell** (Adelphi University): On behalf of the ECAC, we'd like to move Proposal No. 73 in order to exempt the ECAC tournaments from counting.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Carol M. Dunn** (California State University, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee of the NCAA Council, I urge you to support Proposal No. 73.

This proposal was applicable to the sports of baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer and softball and would permit Division II institutions in those sports to exempt annually participation in one season-ending tournament from the maximum number of contest dates of competi-

tion. The proposal would simplify and make consistent the legislation related to annual exemptions by providing postseason opportunities in baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, hockey and softball similar to those that are now offered in basketball, football and volleyball.

That tournament could be the NCAA championship, the NAIA championship for dual members or some other season-ending tournament that involves competition subsequent to the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season.

I urge your support for 73.

[Proposal No. 73 (Page A-174) was adopted.]

#### **Playing and Practice Seasons—First Contest Date— Divisions I and II Soccer**

**Edward P. Markey** (St. Michael's College): I move Proposal No. 80, please.

[The motion was seconded.]

Those of us in the northeast part of the country have a very difficult time completing all schedules within the season. Some inclement weather obviously has an effect on the schedule. In this one-week opportunity, participating a little earlier in the season gives us some flexibility that is important to all of us. We would respectfully urge your support of Proposal No. 80.

**Sharon E. Taylor** (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I asked this question a couple of years ago and didn't get the right answer, so I'm going to try it again.

We have a situation when legislation comes up like this from a single sport that moves the date by one day. Isn't it possible for somebody within the NCAA to get us consistent with the fall sports that are starting so we're not starting one on a Friday, one on a Saturday, one the following Monday and so on?

I don't want to oppose the legislation just because it becomes a pain in the neck.

**Stephen A. Mallonee** (NCAA): The membership has the ability to vote on those and that's where we are. I think that perhaps what you are suggesting is that some thought be given to see if a subcommittee can look at the various sports in the various season and come up with a consistent date that takes into consideration all the various factors so that we don't have these single-sport things coming from time to time. It seems as though after we do a bunch of them for several years, all of a sudden somebody gets tired of it and in one fell swoop it goes away and then it starts all over again.

Interpretively, there is nothing you can do. I think it's something that maybe as Division II gets into its transition process we can look at doing. Short of that, I don't know what to recommend.

**Ms. Taylor**: I would point out that field hockey did do this a year ago with some legislation. I would urge our friends in soccer to be inclusive in their consideration.

[Proposal No. 80 (Page A-182) was adopted.]



### **Division II Football—Scheduling Requirement**

**Robert T. Becker** (Saginaw Valley State University): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 92.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit a Division II institution that sponsors a nonscholarship football program, or that offers fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division II, the opportunity to appeal to the Division II Steering Committee for a waiver of the Division II football scheduling requirements if fewer than six other similar Division II football programs exist within a 500-mile radius of the institution's campus.

Because of their geographical location, a limited number of Division II institutions find themselves isolated from other Division II limited scholarship and nonscholarship football programs and, therefore, aren't able to find a sufficient number of opponents with similar football programs to satisfy the Division II scheduling requirements. Such a result can discourage institutions from sponsoring the sport, or in the alternative, require institutions to increase spending in order to compete against similarly situated institutions.

This waiver will establish an opportunity for appropriate relief for those institutions and will enable them to continue to sponsor their football programs without facing excessive travel and maintenance expenses to secure viable schedules. It should be noted that this waiver currently exists at the Division I-AA level. I urge your support of Proposal No. 92.

[Proposal No. 92 (Page A-192) was adopted.]

### **Coaching Limitations and Playing and Practice Seasons— Emerging Sports For Women**

**Carol M. Dunn** (California State University, Los Angeles): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you will recall, we voted at last year's Convention to establish a timetable for the application of NCAA rules to emerging women's sports. At that time, it was determined that coaching limitations and playing- and practice-season legislation would apply beginning with the 1996-97 academic year. Proposal 99 represents the culmination of discussions with various national governing bodies, representatives of institutions and conferences that sponsor emerging sports for women, and the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics.

I urge you to support this legislation.

[Parts C, D, E, F, G and H of Proposal No. 99 (Page A-198) were adopted.]

### **Recruiting—Telephone Calls—Divisions I and II Basketball**

**Jerry Vandergriff** (Angelo State University): I move Proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal permits one telephone call prior to July 1. This call cannot be made prior to June 1 or the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school, whichever is later.

The purpose of the legislation is to assist coaches in targeting prospects who may be interested in their institutions. If a prospect is interested, the coach can then determine what camps the prospect will be attending and schedule his or her travel schedule. The cost of one telephone call will be significantly less than trips to the summer camp for a prospect who had no interest in the institution. It should be noted that this call will occur at the prospect's end of his or her junior year. I urge your support of this proposal.

**Dan O'Callaghan** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Rollins College): The NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly opposes Proposal 100, which we believe to be a hindrance to the overall welfare of student-athletes.

Basketball players who are completing their junior year, especially those who are highly sought after by many colleges, do not need the extra burden of recruiting calls. During the month of June, athletes have the pressure of finishing final exams and concentrating on college-entrance requirements. If Proposal 100 passes, high-school students could be overwhelmed with phone calls in the proposed one-month period. Current legislation allows coaches to send written information to athletes beginning September 1 of their junior year, thus allowing athletes to become well aware of those colleges that are interested in their athletics talent. In addition to the athlete's awareness of college interest, the respective coaches can become aware of the student-athletes' interest in their programs through reciprocated communication, whether written or verbal on the student-athlete's part.

Also, any information regarding plans for summer-camp attendance can be determined through written information such as a questionnaire as well as from a camp director's entry lists. Therefore, we feel that a phone call to the individual athlete is not vital in determining travel plans for the coach and would become an intensive burden for the athletes in question. Thus, the student-athlete advisory committee strongly urges this body to vote down Proposal 100.

[Proposal No. 100 (Page A-220) was defeated.]

**Ms. Dorn:** At this time, we are going to conclude voting on any further legislation and we will now move to the election of the new NCAA Council members. We will pick up tomorrow with Proposal No. 101 at 8 a.m.

### **Nominating Committee**

[Note: The slate for Division II representatives to the Council was approved as presented.]

**Ms. Dorn:** Prior to closing, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank Rita Castagna, Assumption College, for her service on the Division II Steering Committee and as a Council member. Without question, Rita's service has been invaluable to the Division II membership and certainly to the Division II committee as well.

[The Division II business session was recessed.]

## **Tuesday Morning, January 9, 1996**

The meeting was called to order at 9 a.m., with Lynn L. Dorn presiding.

*Division II Business Session*

129



## OPENING REMARKS

**Ms. Dorn** (North Dakota State University): Good morning. I'd like to call the Division II business session to order. There is going to be a slight departure this morning from what has been printed in the Official Program. It's indicated that we're going to have an issues forum followed by the championships report and then conclude with the rest of the Division II legislation. We're going to reorder that this morning. We're going to continue with legislation. We are now prepared to move to Proposal No. 107.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

### Recruiting—Notes

**Jerry Vandergriff** (Angelo State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale for this legislation is pretty straightforward. First of all, the Recruiting Committee believes that all correspondence with a prospective student-athlete should be sent through the mail. There is no need for anyone to work as a go-between between a coach or young man or woman. Our rules should not permit a third party to act as a "runner" between the coach and the prospect.

Adoption of Proposal 107 helps better ensure that the only intermediary between the institution and the prospective student-athlete will be the mail carrier. By including language specifically precluding the passing of notes to the prospect by a third party on behalf of the institution or staff member—even in those instances in which the prospects are on official or unofficial visits—we intend to eliminate any doubt as to the Association's commitment to eliminating the use of go-betweens and "runners" in the recruiting process.

I urge your adoption of proposal 107.

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-228) was adopted.]

### Evaluations—State Tournaments—Division II

**Mr. Vandergriff**: On behalf of the NCAA Council and Recruiting Committee, I move Proposal No. 108.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal originated with a joint task force of the National Association of Basketball Coaches and the Women's Basketball Coach's Association. The Recruiting Committee reviewed this proposal and believes it is reasonable to allow coaches to attend state championships, semifinals and final games in a state in which the institution is located without being concerned about exceeding the evaluation limit on a prospect. The purpose of attending these games is usually not to evaluate. Due to the nature of the interaction in attending these games, little evaluation is accomplished. I urge your support of the proposal.

**Barry Blizzard** (West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Is this for semifinal and final games only?

**Ms. Dorn**: No, the state tournament.

**Mr. Blizzard**: The entire tournament?

**Ms. Dorn**: Yes, sir.

[Proposal No. 108 (Page A-229) was adopted.]

## Printed Recruiting Materials—Preenrollment Information—

### Divisions I and II

**Mr. Vandergriff**: On behalf of the NCAA Council and Recruiting Committee, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 111.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Ms. Dorn**: This proposal will require an immediate effective date, therefore, we will vote upon that amendment. It will require two-thirds vote.

[The immediate effective date for Proposal No. 111 (Page A-226) was adopted.]

**Mr. Vandergriff**: As indicated in the rationale statement for this proposal, under the current rules, prospective student-athletes who intend to walk on to an institution's athletics team currently aren't able to get preenrollment information from those institutions that subscribe to the National Letter of Intent Program. At times, walk-on students will call the institution where they intend to enroll and request preenrollment information, but are unable to receive this information because they have not signed a National Letter of Intent with that institution.

In most cases, the institution does not intend to sign these individuals to a National Letter of Intent. With the adoption of this proposal, institutions would be permitted to provide enrollment information to those prospects who have been accepted for enrollment and therefore would eliminate any recruiting advantage and better prepare these walk-ons for the academic year. The committee believes it would be in the prospect's best interest to receive the preenrollment information so they would be better prepared for the academic year.

I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 111 (Page A-231) was adopted.]

### Printed Recruiting Materials—Game Programs—Division II

**Fred Jacoby** (Lone Star Conference): We move Proposal 113.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 113 would permit a Division II institution to provide game programs to prospects during official and unofficial visits. This proposal will clarify and simplify the printed recruiting material legislation by allowing game programs to be provided to prospects in both Divisions I and II during official and unofficial visits and will permit inadvertent violations of this rule. Division II institutions already produce game programs, and allowing coaches to give the programs to prospects during a campus visit will not result in any significant cost increase to the institution. We urge your support. Thank you.

**Shirley Green Reese** (Albany State College, Georgia): On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee of the NCAA Council, I urge your support for proposal No. 133. The young man just mentioned the same thing that I was about to say. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 113 (Page A-233) was adopted.]

### Official Visits—Entertainment Allowance

**Jerry Vandergriff** (Angelo State University): I move Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]



I'm sure most of you would agree that a lot has changed since 1992. We all know that for sure. One thing that has not changed is the per diem provided to our student host to entertain prospects on their official visits to our campuses.

The Recruiting Committee believes the proposed increase of \$10 per day with an additional \$5 a day increase for each prospect is reasonable. It is intended to cover the increased costs of most activities and will help better ensure that those who volunteer as a student host will not be put in a situation in which they have to reach into their own pockets to help with the recruiting process.

I urge your adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-238) was defeated, 114-117-2.]

#### **Printed Recruiting Materials—Schedule Cards—Divisions I and II**

**Barbara J. Schroeder** (Regis University, Colorado): I move Proposal No. 114.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1994 Convention, the list of permissible recruiting materials was substantially reduced in the spirit of cost-containment. Schedule cards were eliminated as part of the package. These cards are of zero to negligible cost to the institution. Thus, institutions should be permitted to send schedule cards to prospective student-athletes. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 114 (Page A-234) was adopted.]

#### **Recruiting—Nonscholastic-Based Basketball**

**Jerry Vandergriff** (Angelo State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and Recruiting Committee, I move Proposal No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

At the 1995 Convention, legislation was passed that prohibited those staff members who were participating in coaching activities involved in nonscholastic-based basketball teams. Over the past year, several questions have arisen concerning whether the coaching staff members could participate as members of the team. Although it has always been the intent of the Recruiting Committee to discourage such participation when prospects are involved, the legislation does not indicate such a restriction.

As a result, the Recruiting Committee believes it is appropriate to add language to the legislation that specifically would prohibit participation by coaching staff members on a team that has individuals with eligibility remaining or a team with players of prospect age or younger. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 120 (Page A-239) was adopted.]

#### **Division II Tryouts**

**Doug Echols** (South Atlantic Conference): On behalf of the eight member institutions of the South Atlantic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal 121.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation does not permit spring sport prospective student-athletes to try out until late in the year. This proposal will permit prospects to gather information about prospective institutions and the chances of participating at those institutions. This legislation will en-

courage increased campus visitation at Division II institutions, thus aiding the admissions process.

These tryout opportunities can only occur for high-school seniors enrolled in a term other than the term in which the traditional season in their sport occurs or who have completed eligibility in their sport. Written permission from the student's high-school athletics director continues to be required.

On behalf of the eight member institutions of the South Atlantic Conference, I urge your support for Proposal 121.

**Terry Wanless** (University of North Dakota): Does this then give permission, for example, to bring a basketball prospect in for a tryout in September?

**Ms. Dorn:** The answer Terry is, "yes," as long as it's not the traditional season for the sport in which the student-athlete would be trying out.

**Mr. Wanless:** In high-school basketball, most of the time it's December 1, so anytime outside of that field would be a permissible date?

**Ms. Dorn:** It's traditional based upon the NCAA's traditional season, not the student-athlete. I'm going to have Steve help me.

**Stephen A. Mallonee** (NCAA): Terry, that might be an issue that needs to be clarified post-Convention because you're bringing up a scenario where the legislation says "enrolled in a term other than a term in which the traditional season in the sport occurs." Basketball starts in October in terms of practice, so your traditional season is in the fall somewhat. Or you could argue, it's really a winter sport, so I'm not sure in terms of the sponsor's intent here. I think if the sponsors want to speak to that, that would probably be the appropriate thing.

**Mr. Echols:** The intent was that basketball does occur in both the fall and the spring. So it would be necessary for basketball tryouts to occur after the eligibility was completed.

**Ms. Dorn:** After the eligibility is completed.

**Mr. Echols:** The intent here was to provide greater opportunity for spring sport student-athletes and not to open new doors of opportunity for those in the fall or winter sports.

**Ms. Dorn:** Thank you.

**Mr. Wanless:** Will there be a Council interpretation on this issue?

**Mr. Mallonee:** It probably won't be a Council interpretation because the sponsors of the proposal have clarified the intent. We can certainly put a legislative assistance column together that explains the legislation. We could put that explanation in there so that the membership is aware of that.

**Mr. Wanless:** Thank you.

[Proposal No. 121 (Page A-240) was adopted.]

#### **Recruiting—Written Correspondence—Student-Athletes**

**Barbara J. Schroeder** (Regis University, Colorado) I move Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

Because the general correspondence from enrolled student-athletes to prospects has become difficult to regulate, we propose that existing legislation to allow student-athletes to write to prospects at the direction of the coach and at the expense of the institution has resulted in



instances of coaches requiring student-athletes to engage in letter-writing campaigns to prospects. Not only is this practice costly, but a student-athlete should not be subjected to such a requirement. This proposal continues to allow student-athletes to write prospects on their own and at their own expense.

**H. Frank Leftwich Jr.** (Tuskegee University): My concern is that some of us have gone to a different marketing process— telephone and letter writing. A lot of times, these people are not aware of who is an athlete and who is not an athlete. We have students and faculty people writing letters encouraging students to attend our institutions and those stamps are paid for by the university.

[Proposal No. 102 (Page A-222) was adopted.]

#### **Recruiting—Precollege Expense—Women's Crew**

**Rita M. Castagna** (Assumption College): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow an institution to loan crew equipment to high-school and junior club women's teams and would allow an institution to let those teams use their crew facilities for practice and competition. Women's crew is an emerging women's sport. This proposal will help to encourage the development of women's crew at the club team and high-school level, which ultimately should help to encourage more women to become involved in the sport of crew at the collegiate level.

I urge your support for Proposal 123.

[Proposal No. 123 (Page A-242) was adopted.]

### **REPORTS**

#### **Championships Committee**

**Ms. Dorn:** I believe that now concludes the legislation that needed to be acted upon in the Division II business session. At this time, we're going to call upon Mr. Jerry Hughes to present the championships report on behalf of the Championships Committee.

Jerry has had an invaluable role for the Division II membership. He perhaps has had one of the most extensive backgrounds in Division II. His service has ranged from being on the Council to a member of the Executive Committee, which he currently serves. He also has even served you as the vice-president. Jerry's term on the Executive Committee will end this year. I can assure you he has been a strong voice for us and has been very instrumental in providing Division II with opportunities, including the retention of the \$3 million dollar enhancement fund and access to championships.

On behalf of the Division II Steering Committee, Jerry, thank you for your service. Mr. Jerry Hughes.

**Jerry M. Hughes** (Central Missouri State University): Thank you, Lynn.

On behalf of the Championships Committee, I'd like to present this report, a summary of some of the actions of the previous year. The primary purpose of the Division II Championships Committee is to administer the Division II championships program subject to the approval of the Executive Committee of the NCAA.

I served as chair of this committee for the past year. Other individu-

als on this committee are Robert Becker of Saginaw Valley State, Rita Castagna of Assumption College, Lynn Dorn of North Dakota State and Noel Olson of the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

This past year, 171 of the 250 Division II institutions, a total of 610 teams and 5,611 student-athletes competed in 23 men's and women's championships. Sixty-eight percent of the Division II membership had either an individual student-athlete or a team in a championship. For comparison purposes, 81 percent of Division I had teams or individuals in championships, and 68 percent of Division III had individuals or teams in championships.

Participating institutions in Division II were reimbursed \$2.3 million in transportation and \$1.5 million in per diem. For the second consecutive year, the transportation expenses were reduced. In 1992-93, transportation expenses for Division II were \$2.7 million. In 1993-94, \$2.4 million was spent.

The Division II Championships Committee believes that the concept of regionalization contributed to the decrease in transportation expenses since teams were selected and compared within their regions. In addition, the decrease can be attributed to the selection of championship sites that are in closer proximity to championships participants. Better discounts also are available from the airlines.

Major issues during the past year that were addressed by the committee were reported in The NCAA News. I will try to highlight some of the issues that we addressed.

A change in the enhancement-fund policy. During our May meeting, the Division II Championships Committee voted that the policies and procedures used to administer the enhancement fund would be revised to withhold basketball units from ineligible institutions only from the years in which the institutions are ineligible as opposed to the previous six years. They reached this conclusion after discussing and determining that the policies and procedures that had been used to administer the fund were inconsistent with the equal distribution funds that were withheld from the year in which the institution was ineligible, but the basketball units were withheld for the six years when an institution may have been eligible for the funds. Further, it was a consensus that withholding funds from the previous six years was too stringent.

Official traveling parties and squads for NCAA championships were addressed. After reviewing a report of the official traveling parties and squad sizes for NCAA championships, the Division II Championships Committee increased the squad size for Division II field hockey from 19 to 20, with no increase in the traveling party of 24, and also increased the squad size of Division II women's softball from 18 to 19, with no increase in the traveling party of 24. Both these actions will be in effect during the 1995-96 academic year.

Sports sponsorship report. During its review of the analysis of the sports sponsorship for 1995-96, the committee noted that three sports were below minimum sponsorship requirement of 40 institutions: field hockey at 24; ice hockey at 13; men's lacrosse at 28. However, due to the moratorium on legislation to discontinue these championships,



they continue to be conducted. Other sports near the 40 limit are men's swimming at 47 and wrestling at 44. It should be noted that the same number of institutions sponsored men's swimming in 1994-95; however, two member institutions dropped wrestling in the 1995-96 academic year.

Possible bracket expansion. The committee has requested that the women's soccer committee submit a report for the May 1996 meeting to include rationale and proposed formats for increasing the Division II women's soccer from a championship bracket of eight to 12 teams. Sports sponsorship figures for 1995-96 indicated that a total of 112 institutions sponsored women's soccer. That is 45 percent of the membership. According to the established percentage categories, a 12-team bracket may be considered when 45 to 55 percent membership sponsorship occurs.

Automatic qualification. After hearing responses from the Division II baseball and men's and women's basketball committees regarding why automatic qualification should be provided to conference championships teams in these championships, the committee agreed to eliminate automatic qualification for the Division II baseball championship effective in 1997. Concerning Division II men's and women's basketball, it was decided that the issue of automatic qualification or access to the championships should be forwarded to the Division II restructuring transition team, particularly the issue of whether the formula for the distribution of the enhancement funds should include the men's championship or some other method of distributing the funds.

In conclusion, this has been a brief summary of the Division II Championships Committee actions for the previous year. However, if you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact myself, a member of the committee or Dennis Poppe, NCAA director of championships who serves as a liaison for this committee. Thank you very much.

**Nathan N. Salant** (Gulf South Conference): What is the rationale for the elimination of the baseball automatic bid? We'd just like to hear what that might be.

**Mr. Hughes:** We sent that to the baseball committee. The baseball committee said that if we didn't expand the bracket, we should eliminate automatic qualification because they have gotten in instances only three teams per region. So the committee indicated to us that if we don't expand the bracket to 32 teams or four per region, that we should eliminate automatic qualification. It has been our discussions that regionalized automatic qualification really doesn't go hand in hand because they really do tie the hands of the sports committee. Baseball currently is at a 77 percent sponsorship. That needs to go to 85, so they aren't within the realm currently to receive a 32-team bracket.

### Restructuring

**Ms. Dorn:** Any further questions for Jerry?

At this time, the Division II Steering Committee would like to present an opportunity for the delegates to visit a bit about membership restructuring, to field any questions that you might have concerning the transition team and perhaps, more importantly, to receive any

input from the membership that you might offer to us. Adam Herbert, who served as the cochair, was going to assist us this morning, but because of professional responsibilities, he needed to leave.

Before we move into the discussion, I think it's very important to acknowledge those individuals who served Division II as members of the restructuring task force. They are as follows: Betty Turner Asher, University of South Dakota; Milton Bradley, Delta State University; Clint Bryant, Augusta College; Doug Echols, the South Atlantic Conference; Bud Elwell, Gannon University; Asa Green, Livingston, Alabama; and Margaret Harbison, East Texas State University. As I mentioned, Adam, from the University of North Florida, served as cochair; Jerry Hughes, Central Missouri State University; Jay McGowan, Bel-larmine College; Karen Miller, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; and Diane Reinhard, Clarion University of Pennsylvania. In addition, I would really be remiss if I did not acknowledge the efforts of my predecessor, Chuck Lindemenn, who along with Adam served as the cochair. During the initial and most difficult period of negotiation, President Herbert and Chuck demonstrated prudence, care and skill on behalf of the Division II membership and produced what we believe to be an outstanding structure that will yield tremendous opportunities for each and every one of us within Division II. Please join me in extending our sincere appreciation to President Herbert, Chuck and to the entire restructuring task force.

Two other individuals who I certainly would like to acknowledge are Steve Mallonee, who has been without question an incredible asset to the Division II membership throughout his assignment and in particular restructuring, and Mike Racy, who has been identified by Ced Dempsey as the point person for the entire Association. Mike and Steve have done an incredible job in providing information and documentation. Their services are greatly appreciated. So to Mike and Steve, again, our appreciation.

Finally, we wish to thank each and everyone of you who have provided the task force with insight and direction. As the task force members traveled throughout, they came back identifying that there is a strength in Division II that is reflective of the experience, the knowledge and the values that comprise each and every one of you here today. Your commitment was greatly appreciated and will certainly set the stage for the work that lies ahead as the challenges that now face us are many. I am confident, however, as a collective group we will move forward with prudence and continued care in always keeping the best interests of the Division II membership in hand.

At this time, we'd like to just informally see if there are any questions from the floor.

**Herb F. Reinhard** (Valdosta State University): This perhaps doesn't speak directly to restructuring but perhaps indirectly.

Sunday afternoon, our executive director during his address spoke with great pride in regard to the increase in academic-enhancement funds from \$3 to \$10 million. I found it very interesting and very frustrating that he did not mention at all that those funds were to go to Division I student-athletes. We've all swallowed the fact that approximately 92 percent of moneys distributed by the NCAA go to Division I



institutions. I do not believe that we should continue to swallow and affirm the feeling that student-athletes who compete on the Division II and Division III level are not worthy of a portion of these funds.

Are funds available? Of course they are. Seven million additional dollars were just allocated for Division I athletes. We just placed much of our future in the hands of an Executive Committee made up of presidents. We voted "yes" for Proposal 7 with the hope that these presidents have the wisdom to consider the welfare of all student-athletes, not just those at Division I institutions. The fact that the current Presidents Commission has not taken action to right the wrongs regarding the academic enhancement moneys certainly troubles me. I know that the battle to acquire additional funds is difficult and frustrating.

With that in mind, I challenge and urge our current Division II leadership to work diligently to acquire academic-enhancement funds for Division II and Division III student-athletes. Thank you.

**Gene A. Carpenter** (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): I'm not so sure that that statement is completely correct. I'm on the competitive safeguards committee. I got a fax about a month ago indicating that the increase did take place and that we're going to use that. I'm on a committee with some other people who are looking at dealing with insurance. It's my understanding that is for the whole NCAA. Maybe Ced Dempsey was wrong, but I think that the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports has an insurance committee that's addressing the implementation of funds. We just got that fax because we didn't have enough money to do what we wanted to do. The fax came through about a month ago with the increase from I think \$3 million to \$10 million. So it's not my understanding that that money is just going to Division I athletes.

**Ms. Dorn:** Jean, I believe that you are correct in that that catastrophic-injury insurance guarantee is one of the Association services that Division II will continue to enjoy. Insurance will continue to be provided to the Division II membership.

**Edward H. Hammond** (Fort Hays State University): I think it's important to correct that statement as well about the resource issue, which you have raised and that I know was not correct. You're right about the availability of funds under the guarantee of services. But more importantly, I think with the Executive Committee and the authority that we've given to my fellow presidents, most of whom are Division I presidents, we need to realize it isn't over yet.

This issue of reorganization and restructuring is going to continue to be fine-tuned throughout this year. There are a number of people from Division I who have approached me at this meeting and say they are interested in some alternative proposals that can be voted on next year. We do have next year's Convention to make some final changes in this restructuring. I believe just in the last couple of days that there has been a greater awareness of the authority and power that exists in that Executive Committee. I wouldn't be surprised to see proposals that will give us an opportunity to vote on next year that may make it a little more equitable in terms of the long-term interests of our Association.

**James Fallis** (University of Northern Colorado): We voted on Pro-

posal No. 7 yesterday so the structure is there.

My recommendation would be that we urge our Division II Presidents Commission to work closely with Division I's Presidents Commission. It is my understanding that the Division I presidents are the ones who will have a lot more say about the distribution of those funds in the future. Hopefully, those two bodies can communicate with each other because it is obvious by the outstanding job that our Division II people have done at the Executive Committee level and the restructuring level and the steering committee level has fallen on the deaf ears of Division I athletics directors. I think there is a different concern in terms of who gets the funds and how the funds are distributed.

So President Hammond, I would urge you to get the Division II Presidents Commission, to really get the ear of the Division I Presidents Commission and as this restructuring continues to be fine-tuned, express our concerns to them. Maybe it won't fall on deaf ears as some of these other concerns have. I know that all of those people who have been working very hard to try to get some more funds for Division II have been rather frustrated by some of the things that they have run into. Even though we have a wonderful pot of money, if we need a little bit more, I think communication between presidents would be much more effective.

In addition, before we leave, I would like to acknowledge and commend the chair for the outstanding job in leading this body at this historic Convention. I want to thank you for your wisdom and patience and willingness to remain at the podium even though, as you said in your own words, you don't even want to be there. Thank you.

**Ms. Dorn:** To further motivate some questions, I think it would be important to give you some sense of the timetable in which both the Presidents Commission and the existing Division II Steering Committee would like to see in terms of the actual transition.

We know that the period of time is going to be approximately 12 to 18 months, but we need to validate and to solidify the transition team itself. We are anticipating that President Herbert, who will now chair the Division II Presidents Commission, will call together some individuals to begin to talk about the process of transition and to set forth some of the priorities for the Management Council to begin to evaluate on behalf of the membership.

We anticipate the composition of the Presidents Commission to be put together within approximately a month or two. That is the timetable that we would like to see as well for the additional members necessary on the Division II transition team. That is the 11 positions that we anticipate will be vacant in terms of conference representatives that will be filled hopefully by the end of February. So working groups and a task force for the issues ahead of us will be formed no later than March 1 we hope. That simply means commissioners who do not have a representative on the transition team will receive a letter from the Division II vice-president requesting their slate of candidates for the three positions. Again, the AD, the SWA, and the FAR. If your conference so chooses, you can also forward the name of the commissioner.

The Division II Steering Committee will then come together and



look at the slate of candidates to assure representation for diversity. That slate of candidates will then fill the remaining openings for the 25 positions on the Management Council and then work will begin thereafter. We hope to have some priorities identified by you, the members. We might seek those priorities through regional seminar. We may seek it through conference calls. We may seek it by actually coming on site again and asking for your input. But it's very important for you to know that we believe in the Division II philosophy of one vote per institution. To carry that through. We also believe in receiving your input.

So please come forward with recommendations and suggestions and areas of priorities. Some priorities that I believe the task force will begin to look at will be championships. Is the existing championships structure meeting the needs of the membership? Do we have the access and opportunity that you wish to have? We certainly believe that membership criteria will become something that we want to look at. Financial aid and amateurism. We know that resolution No. 29 was passed and the charge has been given to us. In addition, we believe that as a task force, we will continue to look at methods to evaluate various models of financial aid. Without question, the finances of Division II will be an issue for us. We see a potential surplus of \$2 million. What fiscal responsibility and what behaviors of management must we have in order to continue to be prudent with the dollars that are now our responsibility?

Academic eligibility standards. Do we wish to continue to maintain the transfer rules? Do we wish to enhance our initial-eligibility requirements? President Ramaley indicated that the Academic Requirements Committee is beginning to collect data specific to Division II. We will be able to profile our own demographics of the student-athletes in Division II. There are other priorities that I'm sure you have and that we'd like for you to share with us. Are there any additional comments or anything else that we could perhaps assist you in?

Steve has just reminded me that a very important one is committee structure. As you know, it was negotiated that we are to have at least 11 committees that will be Association-wide. Thereafter, we will have to determine what committees in the substructure of Division II will be important for the membership. Committee appointments and assignments will be part of the work group of the transition team. Any questions?

Seeing none, we'd like to provide before we adjourn today the opportunity for a "window of reconsideration" of any items that were not on the Presidential Agenda day docket. You will also have an opportunity this afternoon in the general business session to come forward with any items for reconsideration.

## RECONSIDERATION OF VOTING ACTION

### Reconsideration of Official Visits—Entertainment Allowance

**Thomas E. Spicer** (Fort Hays State University): We voted on the prevailing side of Proposal 119. We'd like to bring that back to the floor.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Kelly J. Higgins** (University of Alaska Fairbanks): This is basically very permissive legislation.

Since 1982, the consumer price index has gone up 54 percent, as I believe most of you probably know. Twenty dollars then, is \$32 today, approximately. Some, or most of you, don't give out the \$20 for hosting recruits. Some of us do. Some of you are in economic situations where \$20 doesn't buy you two tickets to the movies or where a \$2.99 McDonald meal deal is actually \$4.79. We are in that situation when you live in Fairbanks, Alaska.

I ask you to reconsider that situation. I want you to remember that this is permissive legislation. Consider the fact that some of you also do have sports where you are going to be allowed that \$30 when you have a Division I sport. I don't think it's going to be difficult to separate the sports when you look at that. It just creates another level that you have to consider. Do I have to give this student \$20 or this student \$30? I urge you to reconsider and vote for 119. Thank you.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 119 (Page A-238) was adopted, 128-102-2.]

**James Fallis** (University of Northern Colorado): When we went through the legislation on our campus with the student-athlete advisory committee, we talked about existing dollars. We talked about increasing this pot right here. They were very concerned that it was going to come out of existing dollars, dollars that the students presently are using. For equipment, travel, things of that nature. It was going to diminish their opportunities. I see this as a classic case of keeping up with the Joneses. You increase it to \$30 and you tell your staff to live with it in your existing dollars. They are going to come back to say but such and such has got \$30. Our coaching staff was opposed to seeing this increase. I urge your defeat. Thank you.

**Ms. Higgins** Jim, I appreciate the decisions at Northern Colorado. Our students also mentioned that when we discussed raising it from \$20 to \$30. They said they can't get by on \$20 at all for half of a day at times. It is in essence a decision of the athletics director as to how much money each individual student or sport gets as a part of this. Again, it's permissive. It's only keeping up with the cost of the consumer price index, not with the Joneses. Thank you.

**Mr. Fallis:** If this passes in Division I, those institutions in Division II that have a Division I sport, will they be allowed to use the \$30 for their Division I sport and still use \$20 for Division II if it doesn't pass?

**Ms. Dorn:** Yes. Only in that sport, Jim.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-238) was adopted upon reconsideration, 120-111-2.]

**Ms. Dorn:** Are there any other issues from the floor for reconsideration? Prior to calling for entertaining a motion to adjourn, I'd like to thank Paul Engelmann, our parliamentarian, for his service throughout the business session. I know for me it was very important and very productive to have him. Thanks, Paul.

At this time I would entertain a motion to adjourn the Division II business session.

[The motion was seconded and the Division II business session was adjourned.]



# ■ Division III Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1996

The Division III business session was called to order by Division III Vice-President Edward G. Coll Jr., Alfred University, at 10:17 a.m.

## OPENING REMARKS

**Mr. Coll:** Good morning and welcome today to the Division III business session. Joining me on the dais this morning are Joe O'Rourke, faculty representative from Wabash College, who will serve as our parliamentarian; Dan Dutcher from the NCAA staff, who will serve as our Division III liaison; and Debbie Reithmeyer from Kansas City, who will be our recording secretary.

Our task between now and 3:30 this afternoon is to complete the portion of the Division III agenda identified for Presidential Agenda Day.

*[Note: Various announcements were made and voting procedures were explained.]*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

**Mr. Coll:** I would like to make a brief comment. I hope you share my excitement about our agenda today. We witnessed the first steps in the formation of a new NCAA during this morning's general business session. It's difficult to fully appreciate the scope of the historical significance of that fact. I'm sure it will become more evident over time. The topics we are about to discuss this morning and this afternoon are no less significant. As we acknowledged during yesterday's Division III forum, we have an incredible opportunity before us at this Convention. Over the next 18 months, we have an opportunity not only to solidify our government structure but also to begin to redefine Division III and establish a clearer identity for our division. I'm not sure where this path will take us, but I encourage you to fully participate in this process and enjoy what should continue to be an interesting, challenging and rewarding process.

We are now prepared to continue with our agenda and receive two committee reports. For the first report, I would like to introduce President Mike Adams of Centre College, who will present the report of the Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission.

### Presidents Commission

**Michael F. Adams** (Centre College): Thank you, Ed, and ladies and gentlemen. NCAA regulations require that the Presidents Commission make a report at the annual meeting to the respective memberships in Divisions I, II and III. As the senior person in length of service rotat-

ing off the Commission at this meeting, I've been asked to do that. I will do so in rather brief fashion. I would like to begin by asking President David Carter, the chair of the Presidents Commission, to stand. We are all indebted to David for his leadership in chairing this year and last year. (Applause)

As each of you might imagine, the Presidents Commission has spent most of its discussion time during the last 12 months on the matter of NCAA restructuring. I think that the results of our collegial relationship with you and our working together is reflected in the fact that over 90 percent of you voted in favor of Proposal No. 7 earlier this morning.

There are several specific matters in the program that I want to call to your attention to because there are areas in which Division III has taken a significant leadership role. First of all, your representatives in Division III on the Commission took a significant leadership role in increasing the size of the proposed Executive Committee. While there are certainly concerns, and they are legitimate, there are two members of Division III on the Executive Committee. I would remind you that originally there was only one, and that that was part of the compromised package that was put together through working with the various other committees. In this way, committee membership will ultimately become more diverse and also can better express the viewpoints of the diverse nature of the Division III membership.

Secondly, the Presidents Commission has been very involved in expressing opinions regarding presidential governing bodies in the new structure in which each division will now have an opportunity not only to meet individually but also to come together as an association to express common notions. Those of you who have not been close to the process would be surprised at how diverse and dissected the original proposals were as far as the inclusion of Division III is concerned. We believe that the proposed presidential groups will continue to meet together on an annual and probably more often basis. We think that has been a step in the right direction. We were also the first division to urge caution regarding the proposed establishment of proxy voting that has been advocated by a number of people in Division I. I would remind you that we have retained the one school, one vote proponent positions in Division III. I believe that the position that was taken by the committee on restructuring as well as your Executive Committee in that regard has served you well.

We've also spent a great deal of time discussing restructuring issues that specifically relate to Division III. As I said to some of you in the CEO forum yesterday, we now have what we have asked for for a number of years. We may be here next year having met the enemy in some cases and realize that it is we. We now do have perhaps more than at any time in history our fate in regard to our own rule structure in our own hands. Matters such as championships, access, divisional membership requirements and a whole host of other matters will have to be decided by us as a group over the years immediately ahead.

I want to emphasize that the Presidents Commission has worked very closely this year with the Division III task force on restructuring. There are two additional people who I want you to recognize and



thank at this time. While every member of the restructuring committee has made a particularly important contribution to the group, we are especially indebted as members of Division III to Mr. Dan Bridges of Cal Tech, and to Mr. Jim Appleton, the president at Redlands University, both in California. I would like to ask Dan and Jim to stand and be recognized by you for their work with the restructuring committee. (Applause)

There have been in excess of 10 meetings held by the restructuring committee and numerous interactions between the Presidents Commission and the restructuring committee over the past 12 months. Members of our subcommittee have attended meetings that focused on possible championship enhancements. Task force members have attended subcommittee meetings that have proven to be extremely productive in dealing with a number of the issues that will come before us in subsequent Conventions.

I think you will see that the financial arrangements that have been worked out for Division III are the most lucrative arrangements in support of Division III activities in our history. These issues will become more clear and the details more widely known as we move through the succeeding years. Finally, the nominating committee within the Commission nominated three new presidents—Gordon Haaland of Gettysburg College; Bob Neff of Juniata College; and Sam Williamson of the University of the South.

Let me simply end the report, President Coll, by expressing once again appreciation to those of you who have worked so closely with us over the last 12 months. Let me personally thank the membership for the opportunity to serve as vice-chair of the Commission on your behalf over the past four years. I believe that the Presidents Commission and the other important entities in Division III—faculty athletic reps, ADs, coaches and others—have set a model for the NCAA Convention as a whole as far as collegiality and moving forward is concerned. Personally, it's been my privilege to serve you in this capacity. I express my appreciation to each one of you. Thank you. (Applause)

**Mr. Coll:** Thank you, President Adams. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Division III members of the Commission for their hard work and their dedication during the past year. I especially would like to express my appreciation again to Mike Adams and President Bob Bruce of Widener University, both of whom are completing their respective terms on the Commission. They have served the Commission and Division III membership with dedication and distinction. I ask you to join me in expressing our gratitude to Mike Adams and Bob Bruce for their service in the Association. (Applause)

Our second report will describe the work of the Division III Steering Committee during the past year. It will be presented by Linda Moulton, director of athletics at Clark University. Linda, please.

#### **Steering Committee**

**Linda Moulton** (Clark University, Massachusetts): Thank you, President Coll.

The Division III Steering Committee consists of the 11 members who are listed with the rest of the NCAA Council beginning on page 312 of the Convention Notice. On behalf of the steering committee, I

would like to present a summary of our work during 1995.

As you would expect, like the Presidents Commission, we also spent a significant amount of time on issues related to membership restructuring. In that regard, we worked closely with the Division III task force on restructuring and enthusiastically recommended that the council sponsor Proposal No. 7. All members of the steering committee who did not initially serve on the task force were added to that committee later in order to ensure more continuity during the anticipated transitions.

The steering committee strongly supported the establishment of a moratorium on new provisional members, which was proposed by the Joint Policy Board as noncontroversial legislation. This moratorium was meant to resolve the new government structure in an orderly and deliberate fashion. We also recommended to the oversight committee on restructuring that the scope and function of certain committees continue on an Association-wide basis in the new structure in order to retain and enhance the fundamental nature of the NCAA as an Association consisting of three membership divisions.

Another related topic we focused on was the development and presentation of models of Division III membership and championship criteria, which will be discussed in greater detail during this morning's and this afternoon's business sessions. The steering committee suggested that the task force use this opportunity together with the membership to possibly conduct regional hearings to obtain feedback from the membership regarding these models. This would give the task force sufficient time and input from the membership to make a recommendation to the Division III subcommittee and the Presidents Commission during its June meeting. Again, an opportunity for input regarding this process will occur later today.

We also expressed an interest in having Division III institutions included in the discussions and planning of the proposed program initiated by the United States Olympic Committee and the NCAA as it relates to Olympic hopefuls. We noticed that the NCAA has many institutions that would support these levels and may be more readily available than Divisions I or II facilities. Further, the increased involvement in Division III may provide an untapped source in broadening the grass roots support of these sports.

Finally, we dealt with a number of routine agenda items such as considering waiver requests of membership requirements and the review of legislation and interpretations that affect Division III.

On a personal note—I know I also speak for Mr. Coll—I thank the membership for the opportunity to serve you and to also thank our colleagues on the Division III Steering Committee for the privilege of working with all of you. It has been an honor and a tremendously rewarding experience for both of us. Thank you very much. (Applause)

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**

**Mr. Coll:** Thank you, Linda. As Linda said, she and another member of our steering committee, Dennis Collins, conclude their service this year. Dennis is commissioner of the North Coast Athletic Conference. Linda and Dennis have really provided some extraordinary ser-



vice to our division. I wonder if you would join me in giving them another round of applause for their service. (Applause)

We are now ready to vote on legislative proposals identified for consideration during Presidential Agenda Day. We are having some difficulty with the voting computers. Parliamentary requirements indicate that we need a motion from the Presidents Commission to suspend our voting requirements. I'm going to ask President Mike Adams if he will offer a motion on that order to the Convention floor.

**Michael F. Adams** (Centre College): I'm advised by counsel and by parliamentary procedure that the Presidents Commission member representing you in Division III has the right to designate and to undesignate matters on which roll call voting is required. Because of the technical glitches that we are currently experiencing and as the senior person on the dais for the Presidents Commission, I've been asked to move that vote by paddles. In view of your time constraints and that many presidents have come for Presidential Agenda Day, this action will allow us to move the agenda forward without the recorded votes. I am somewhat taken aback by the power to decree such, but I'm advised that we do indeed have that authority. So I will at this time suggest with some trepidation that we move forward and vote by paddle to move the agenda forward rather than by electronic voting.

**Mr. Coll:** I've been asked to tell you for the minutes that the constitutional provision that allows the Adams mandate you just heard to be 4.5.3 (g). Using that as a record for the minutes, we will now proceed. We are now ready to vote on the legislative proposals.

#### **NCAA Membership Restructuring**

**James R. Appleton** (University of Redlands): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the Council, I move the adoption of Proposals No. 7-M, 7-P, 7-R, 7-AA, 7-FF and 7-HH.

[The motion was seconded.]

As cochair of the Division III Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure, and on behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I would like to speak in favor of the sections of the proposal that comprise the Division III governance plan. During the past 18 months, the group that was selected to represent Division III's interests in the Association's restructuring effort has met several times. Our division has been fortunate because we've been able to organize such a large and diverse task force with Dan Bridges as chair.

The Division III governance plan that we will consider in a few minutes is the product of many ideas, suggestions, viewpoints and certainly compromises. I believe this governance plan offers the best of two systems. It maintains our current system of conducting divisional business while incorporating the three most important general principles that we adopted earlier this morning—presidential authority, a simplified administrative structure and greater autonomy for this division. In addition, this new system offers greater opportunities for individuals to get involved in the management of our division.

In the task force's early discussions with many of you and from the correspondence we received, it became clear that the Division III membership's support for restructuring would be conditional on accommodations as well as guarantees and assurances that we needed

as a division, as illustrated by championship funding, access to national office services and catastrophic insurance coverage. I am happy to report that due to the cooperative nature of the discussions that occurred with our colleagues in the other divisions, the key issues that were identified by the Division III membership, from my point of view, have been adequately and appropriately addressed. As a result, the restructuring plan represents an agreement whereby Division III's needs and desires have, in my opinion, the best opportunity to have been answered. It is clear at the same time that our division, more than any other, faces numerous intradivisional issues that we must address in the year ahead. In fact, most of us in this room feel that these are the most important issues.

To address these issues in a timely and appropriate manner, our division needs two things. First, we must be guaranteed resources to address membership and championship issues. Second, we need greater autonomy so that the leaders of our division are the individuals who will actually chart the future course for our division. This governance plan is not perfect. But combined with the Association-wide agreements and documented assurances that have been made, it provides our division with the necessary autonomy, authority and financial resources that will allow us to control our own destiny and success.

Your vote in favor of the Division III governance plan will be the necessary first step to achieve our objectives as a division. On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I urge your support for these proposals.

**Daniel L. Bridges** (California Institute of Technology): As cochair of the Division III Task Force to Review the Membership Structure, I would also like to speak in favor of the sections that comprise the Division III governance plan. I concur with President Appleton's assessment that this governance maintains all the essential elements of our existing legislative structure and process. The composition and duties of the Division III Presidents Council as set forth in Proposal No. 7-M are quite similar to those in the current Division III subcommittee of the Presidents Commission. Likewise, the composition and the duties of the Division III Management Council as set forth in Proposal No. 7-P are very similar to those of the Division III Steering Committee. One notable exception is that the new Management Council will be expanded to include 16 members, as opposed to the steering committee's current number of 11. That will provide us with more appropriate representation ratios and greater diversity. In addition, Proposal Nos. 7, 7-AA, 7-FF and 7-HH detail how Division III will obtain the one institution, one vote system of governance. Therefore, the division will continue to conduct its legislative business in an annual Convention setting.

Our division will benefit immensely from the guarantees we receive as a result of this morning's vote and through the establishment of this governance plan. While there are still many details to be decided and adjustments to be made, this legislation provides us with the basic framework necessary to proceed. It is imperative that we adopt the Division III governance plan today. Without this structure, our ability to address membership and championship issues will be severely de-







ball. For those of you who weren't here, I would just like to give you a brief background. A few years ago, we had taken a vote to drop our contests down to 10. During that period of 10 contests, you had the opportunity to play nine and have a scrimmage or play eight and have two scrimmages. Unless I'm reading this incorrectly, this is just a backdoor way of way of getting an additional contest in because right now every institution here has the opportunity to have this scrimmage already. This will force all institutions to have 10 games plus a scrimmage if they choose to have potential opportunities for postseason competition. I am urging all the members to defeat this proposal for those reasons.

**John M. Schael** (Washington University, Missouri): Last year, I opposed this issue as well. I'm glad that in the year 1996 we see that the Council supports this piece of legislation as well as the Presidents Commission. While this provides another opportunity for football-playing institutions, it doesn't require anybody to scrimmage. We can still maintain the 10 games or you can elect to have a scrimmage as well. I urge your adoption of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 41 (Page A-118) was adopted.]

## DISCUSSION

### Membership Restructuring

**Mr. Coll:** The voting on Presidential Agenda Day legislation has now been completed. The polls are closed for the morning. We are now prepared to begin our discussion regarding membership restructuring. As the Convention Program indicates, we will focus on three aspects of this series of revisions. First, we will discuss possible enhancement to existing championships that may become possible due to the increased percentage of overall Association revenue that will be guaranteed Division III in the new NCAA membership restructuring.

Second, we will discuss possible revisions to the Division III membership requirements. We will look at the significant growth that our division has experienced in recent years and will experience again after the membership moratorium expires in 1997.

Third, we will discuss possible revisions to the Division III championship structure to provide opportunities for greater access to championship participation for our student-athletes. You will receive a lot of information over the next few hours. We know how important these topics are to the future of our division. What we need, of course, is someone who can introduce all of these topics in more detail and put the three of them in perspective for us. There can be no better person to perform that task than Dan Bridges, who cochairs our restructuring task force.

**Daniel L. Bridges** (California Institute of Technology): Thank you, Ed.

Now that the framework for restructuring has been established, it is time for us as a division to focus our attention on the key intradivisional issues that will so profoundly affect Division III athletics. Accordingly, as Ed mentioned, our task force on restructuring has prepared three distinct presentations to be delivered this afternoon. Your consideration and feedback on these discussions will be most appreciated.

ated, as they have been in the past.

The first of these presentations will focus on post-restructuring championships. Specifically, you will be presented with recommendations as to the establishment of firm and consistent guidelines for establishing championship-field sizes, and based upon these guidelines, what our championships might look like in the 1997-98 academic year when the new restructuring legislation and increased funding levels become effective.

The second of these presentations will deal with task force recommendations in the area of Division III membership requirements. Once again, as Ed mentioned, we all know there's currently a membership moratorium on accepting new applications. The restructuring task force feels that because of this moratorium and because of the legislation that we're considering relative to restructuring, that we have an excellent window of opportunity to take a look at our membership requirements in relation to our philosophy. We have a stated philosophy that discusses things such as broad-based programming, and we want to look at our membership requirements in relation to that philosophy. You will hear suggestions as to how we can tighten up regulations for membership and bring us more into compliance with that stated philosophy before the moratorium is lifted.

For the third presentation, we'll look at possible models and methods of reorganizing Division III championships play some time in the future. Not to be confused with the first discussion regarding immediate adjustments within our existing championship structure, this third discussion will focus on the possibility of us some day making fundamental changes to our championship structure, establishing subsets of championships groupings. This discussion is being presented to you because we have heard in many of our conference visits, at the NACDA convention last year and somewhat at the NCAA Convention last year considerable interest in at least looking into the possibility of either subdividing our membership or creating some different championships categories that will allow us to compete in more similar groupings. We hope to give that issue a complete airing today and get your feedback on that.

Before breaking for lunch, I wish to express my appreciation to our Presidents Commission representatives and task force members who have spent so much time and energy guiding us through this sometimes treacherous and difficult process. I also wish to thank all members of Division III who shared with us their questions, concerns and comments at last year's Convention and throughout the year. Your input has been instrumental in getting us to this point. Furthermore, I assure you that the input you provide today and throughout this next year will be equally valued and considered by the task force and the Division III representatives of the Presidents Commission.

As I mentioned earlier, we very much look at this as a starting point. We now have the financial resources and the autonomy to shape our division the way we want and to do with our division what we feel is best in the interest of our student-athletes. I urge you to come back after lunch prepared to discuss these issues, prepared to give us as much feedback as you possibly can, whether it sounds positive or negative.



ative to the points that the task force might be making. Those are important to us. I also urge you to attend tomorrow's session and to become involved. We will have further opportunities for feedback. Today, our intention is to have discussion and feedback.

Tomorrow, the task force intends to distribute a written survey on which each of you will be able to provide your input. We can calculate those responses and it will give us some really good guidance going into this next year. So once again, please come back ready to offer your input and put your two cents in. We do value you tremendously. If we all continue to work together as we have in the past, I'm sure that we'll be able to achieve a very bright and prosperous future for Division III. Thank you.

**Mr. Coll:** We are going to pass out some information that you might want to take to lunch. The first document you are going to receive will assist in our discussion of the championship enhancements. This afternoon, we're going to have a panel presentation on these various topic issues. At this time, we are certainly going to encourage some broad-based participation from the group.

We're going to set you free early so that you have some time to freshen up before lunch. We are now adjourned.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.]

## Monday Afternoon, January 8, 1996

The Division III business session was reconvened by Mr. Coll, Division III vice-president and chair, at 1:01 p.m.

### OPENING REMARKS

**Mr. Coll:** We are ready now to begin the afternoon session of the Division III business session. We are going to use this occasion to introduce you to several panels to discuss Division III reorganization and restructuring, which we know is key to all of us with regard to future direction of our division. I'm going to ask the cochair of our Division III task force, Dan Bridges, if he will now come to the microphone and start our panel presentation.

### REPORTS

#### Restructuring

**Daniel L. Bridges** (California Institute of Technology): Joining me on the dais are three representatives of our task force, which will actually be making this presentation. At the far end, the director of athletics from Washington and Lee University, Mike Walsh. Next to Mike, the director of athletics from Swarthmore, Bob Williams. And then closest to me on my right, director of athletics from the University of California, San Diego, Judy Sweet. Also joining us on the dais will be President Carter from Eastern Connecticut State University representing the Presidents Commission. This presentation will be relatively short, so we ask that you hold all of your questions and comments until the end, at which time we'll entertain a full discussion of the issue before proceeding to the next presentation.

At this time, I would like to introduce Judy Sweet, who will come forward to present our recommended guidelines for championship

brackets.

**Judith M. Sweet** (University of California, San Diego): Thank you, Dan. Good afternoon. Before I share some championships information with you, I would like to just relay a short story on the way I walked into this room. After this morning's business session, I had the pleasure of walking with Layton Shoemaker. As we left the general session, Layton noticed something on the ground and quickly picked it up. People who know me pretty well know that I have a tendency to pick up every penny that I find. I'm somewhat superstitious and every penny is worth an extra cent. So Layton picked it up and being the gentleman that he is, he handed it over to me for good luck. We both looked at it, and his first comment was, "it looks like it's a foreign coin." I turned it over, and on the back side it said, "no cash value." So I'm not sure what all of that means, but I just wanted to share that with you.

This afternoon, I have the pleasure of giving you some history that hopefully will set the stage for the discussions that will follow my presentation. I think it's important that as we look to our new structure and the opportunities that this new structure will allow us that we not lose sight of where we've been, how far we've come and perhaps how far we may be able to go in the future. There is an article in the Convention edition of The NCAA News written by Ron Mott that traces the history of change that has taken place within the NCAA structure. It doesn't address changes that have taken place as they apply to championships. That's what I would like to share with you this afternoon.

The new structure will allow us an opportunity to autonomously review and make changes as appropriate to the championships program for Division III. The history that I will share with you is based on my memory as well as a review of the history of the organization. I've had the privilege of first being involved with the NCAA Division III Steering Committee going back to 1982, before the NCAA Council was changed from a 14-person body to the 44-person body that it currently is. I then was involved with the steering committee in its new form as part of the NCAA Council followed by the honor of serving as Division III vice-president, which put me in direct contact with the NCAA Executive Committee. I subsequently had four years of experience with the Executive Committee in my capacity as secretary-treasurer and president of the Association. I have seen significant changes. It's important that we remember when we look at commitment that the Association has been good to the championship program. We are mindful that what we are enjoying right now has not always been in place. At one point, there was no provision of funding for transportation or per diem for NCAA championships. That was subsequently changed to allow for providing transportation expenses to championships. That was further changed to add per diem to expenses allowed for member institutions. The championships sponsored were determined by NCAA legislation, which mandated a certain minimum number of institutions to sponsor a particular sport that resulted in championships, in some instances at the divisional level, in other instances only national championships. The number of spots allocated for institutions to actu-



ally participate in championships reflected a legislative mandate at that point in history based on ratios of participants and sponsoring institutions. Initially, that ratio was approximately 1 to 8 in team sports and approximately 1 to 24 in individual sports.

But there was a very important twist to the actual bracket size. The Executive Committee ultimately made its decision on bracket size based on what it defined as "quality of competition." So even though there might be a large number of sponsoring institutions, if the Executive Committee felt that the quality of competition in a particular sport was not at a level that institutions should be participating in championships, that bracket size was kept smaller than the ratio might dictate. Recommendations for bracket expansion typically are initiated with sports committees.

There was an additional layer that was built into the system in the late 1980s—the development of divisional championships committees. So the sports committees would make a recommendation. The divisional championships committees would review those recommendations and then those committees would take the recommendation to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee was a 14-person body with two representatives from Division III, two representatives from Division II and all of the other representatives from Division I. That sounds somewhat familiar to some things that we've seen recently. The decisions on whether brackets should be expanded were made by this committee. I would be less than honest if I didn't admit that there were several struggles and several battles fought any time there was interest in expanding the Division III brackets, with the excuse being we don't feel that the quality of competition warrants expansion of brackets and we're not willing to commit more funding to those championships.

One of the most significant steps in the development of the Division III championships program occurred at a Convention that I believe was in the mid-1980s or late 1980s. The Division III track and field sports committee had for years been asking for the initiation of an indoor track and field championship. The Executive Committee, through their powers, was not willing to sponsor the championship. Consequently, both Division II and Division III brought to the Convention floor a proposal to initiate an indoor track and field championship. The numbers were there, the interest was there, the level of athleticism was there. It overwhelmingly was supported at the Convention. The Executive Committee acknowledged that there would be a championship, but there would be no funding provided for those institutions participating in the championship.

The next action taken by the Executive Committee to avoid such situations in the future was to implement a block grant for Division II and Division III. That block grant was to assign a specific amount of money to each of those divisions and then allow the division to determine what they wanted to do with the championships. Again, it sounds a little bit familiar with what we are experiencing currently. But there is a major difference. The block grant in the late 1980s was \$1.1 million. The block grant—although that's not the term that's being used as we approach our new structure; rather, a percentage is

being assigned to the overall Association budget—is projected to take us from our current funding of approximately \$5 million to first-year funding of \$7 million. At the end of the existing television contract, potentially over \$9 million would be provided to Division III for its championships program. Now the question is, what do we do? What makes sense for Division III? The Division III task force, before there was finalization of what financial arrangements might occur, was also looking at our existing championships program and determined that there was some inconsistency in championship-field sizes in both team individual sports that should be addressed. As a result, there have been a few recommendations that have come from the task force that I would like to share with you. I believe that they are also highlighted in the document that you received this morning—Division III brackets and field size report.

The first recommendation that is being considered is that in team sports we return to applying a ratio based on the number of member institutions that sponsor a particular sport. That ratio in team sports would range from approximately 1 to 8 to 1 to 12. The variance is to address what we feel are some important guiding principles: Consideration for academic priorities of students and consideration of the impact of the championship structure on potential missed class time for student-athletes. In discussing this particular concern with representatives of the Presidents Commission, the presidents felt that the championships program postseason should not exceed three weeks of competition overall.

Another guiding principle that we felt would be very important is that all sports should be treated according to the same set of guidelines. There are a couple of cautions that I would like to share with you as we look at what new opportunities might be available to us. There has been expressed concern that the size of Division III may change dramatically in the future. As we attempt to balance projected increases in our size with interest in possibly making some changes to our championship program, I think it's most important that our decisions are based on a Division III philosophy that we not lose sight of what Division III is supposed to be about. Too often we compare ourselves and the opportunities in our championships program to Divisions I and II and make decisions because Divisions I or II have taken certain actions. I also think that it's important for us to be mindful that as we worked through the restructuring plan, we were able to get the entire Association to acknowledge that if there is a significant migration of new members into the Association, it is not just a Division II problem, it is not just a Division III problem. It is, in fact, an issue that impacts the entire Association. There might be additional funding that could be needed in order to accommodate that migration. Any changes that we make to our championships program will be looked at if, in fact, in the future we appeal to the new Executive Committee for additional funding based on an increase in the numbers of our membership.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that the new structure allows us to independently make decisions based on Division III needs and priorities. As we do this, I sincerely hope that we will reflect on



our Division III philosophy. We will develop principles that are consistent with that philosophy and that we will do things that are in the best interest of the Division III student-athletes who we are fortunate to accommodate. At this time, it's my pleasure to introduce two other task force members who will talk about the specific recommendations on a sport-by-sport basis, Mike Walsh and Bob Williams.

**Robert E. Williams** (Swarthmore College): It's always a difficult task trying to follow Judy Sweet. I won't try to do that, but I do think I can match her stories with one of my own.

Just before lunch, a young fellow approached me and said that since you've been attending a number of these Conventions, you must be an expert. It puzzled me a bit. I went up to my room and found an old dictionary. I could not find the word expert but I did find the word in part, "ex" meaning, "has been" and then I found "spurt" meaning a "drip under pressure." So I don't know whether that was a compliment or not.

My part in this is very brief. I have been asked to review the summary of recommendations as they relate to the individual sports. I will begin with cross country. I will walk through this and hopefully generate some discussion. The field size for the cross country championship is at 184. The recommendation from the sports committee was for 200. That recommendation was not supported by the championships committee or the task force. You will find an explanation for that in the middle of the report. Men's golf is at 120. The sports committee did not recommend a change, and that was supported by the championships committee and the restructuring task force. In women's golf, the anticipated field size is for 36. Be reminded that this is a developing sport. The first championship will be held in 1996. No change was recommended by the sports committee and that was also supported by the task force and the championships committee. For men's and women's swimming, the current men's championship field size is at 209 and the women at 216. The sports committee recommended 280 for both men and women. No change was recommended from the championships committee and from the task force. Both men's and women's tennis is at 124. No change was recommended on the part of the sports committee or by the championships committee and the task force. For men's and women's indoor track, the men's field size is at 158 and the women's field is at 149. The sports committee recommended that we stay at those numbers. However, it felt very strongly, as Judy indicated, that we fully fund the championship in men's and women's outdoor track and field, the men's field is at 344 and the women at 330. The feeling was that we maintain those numbers, and the sports committee felt very strongly that the championships should be fully funded. As Judy indicated, the current policy is that institutions must select reimbursement for either the indoor or the outdoor championship. If this recommendation continues to go forward for indoor and outdoor track and field, all of our championships will then be fully funded. Finally, wrestling is at a field size of 200. No change was recommended on the part of the sports committee and that was supported by the championships committee and the task force.

Even though a great deal of work has gone into the preparation of

this report, it is in fact, early thinking, and presented at this time to gain your input. I will pass this along to Mike.

**Michael F. Walsh** (Washington and Lee University): Thank you, Bob. I hate to disappoint you, but I have no stories. However, keeping the team championships ratio of 1 to 8 to 1 to 12 in mind, the Division III restructuring committee reviewed both the sport committee's recommendation and the Division III Championships Committee's comments, and we offer the following suggestions regarding team sports in national championship brackets. We support the championships committee's recommendation that men's and women's lacrosse brackets be increased from eight to 12. We support that women's soccer brackets be increased from 20 to 32. We further support that women's softball brackets be increased from 24 to 32; and that women's volleyball brackets be increased from 32 to 40. Finally, our committees suggested that men's and women's basketball brackets be increased from 32 to 48 fully funded teams. We found the championships committee's first recommendation that brackets expand to 64 fully funded teams to be inconsistent with the 1 to 8 to 1 to 12 ratio. Forty-eight fully funded teams permit us to be consistent with the ratio and equitable in all team championship fields. That concludes my portion of the report on team championships. Of course, we would welcome any questions that you might have.

**Mr. Bridges** (California Institute of Technology): Thank you. That was a rather straightforward presentation. As you can imagine, there are a number of nuances here and a considerable amount of work that's gone into these recommendations. As I mentioned before lunch, we really want to give these recommendations and guidelines a full hearing. I invite you to come forward to the microphones, be recognized and ask any questions that you may have or provide us with any comments or suggestions you may have. Would anybody care to comment?

**Thomas J. Allen Jr.** (Massachusetts Institute of Technology): I wonder if someone up there on the podium could give us a little tutorial or some instructions on how the ratio figures were arrived at. There's a group of us who may be a little bit rusty in our arithmetic. We can't replicate the same numbers.

**Mr. Bridges:** Other than that one change made earlier, we believe these ratios are accurate. If not, please bring those to our attention at this time.

**Mr. Allen:** I'm not claiming they are inaccurate. I'm just claiming we can't do it. Maybe you can tell us how you arrived at them. Are they simply the number of teams sponsoring the sports that's divided by a number? They don't come out right, if that's the case. We even tried taking the ratio, for example, of men's cross country—74 percent—and saying that that means taking the 361 teams you started with and dividing it. Take a look at men's and women's cross country. The field size is the same proposal—184.

**Mr. Bridges:** May I?

**Mr. Allen:** We have 267 men's teams and 268 women's teams—roughly the same number but our ratios are very, very different.



**Mr. Bridges:** I'm sorry we didn't clarify. On the individual sports, we're looking at individual participants. That's why the numbers are different. We arrived at the ratios for team sports by simply dividing the number of championship bracket opportunities into the total number of teams sponsoring that sport. In the individual sports, we took the total number of participants who participated in those sports last year and divided that number by the number of individuals who actually qualified to go to those championships. So you are right.

**Mr. Allen:** The total number, the number that you used, is not available to us on here.

**Mr. Bridges:** That's correct. We apologize for that. That's an excellent point and that should have been clarified. That's correct. So when you evaluate these, when you look at these as to the ratios and compare on the individual sports, we are talking about the total number of participants that were reported in those sports to the NCAA for the 1993-94 academic year. We're assuming that those numbers are still relatively accurate.

**John D. Galaris** (Salem State College): I am looking at the rationale that was presented. It seems to me there are two primary considerations: One being missed class time, and that we wanted to treat all sports relatively equally. That's why the need for the ratio. It also seems to me that something else is missing—the interest that the sports generate and the opportunities presented to not only member institutions but student-athletes, and I'm talking specifically about men's and women's basketball. As a former member of the Division II basketball committee and one of the architects of the 64-team tourney, our membership clearly indicated that it was an important issue to have the opportunity to participate. Students missed no more class time whether there was 48 teams or 64 teams.

The budget is clearly expanding to provide more opportunities. I congratulate the committee for those opportunities that it has recommended for various other sports. But I fail to understand why they want to reduce the opportunity when there are quality teams out there participating.

**Mr. Bridges:** Since we only have one microphone, please bear with us. I would like to get all members of our committee involved in this discussion. Judy will respond to that.

**Judith M. Sweet** (University of California, San Diego): John, I think there are a couple of things that we need to keep in mind.

No. 1, the expanded bracket. Men's and women's basketball has only been in place for one year. This previous year was the first time that there was a play-in for basketball. The committee felt very strongly that there should be consistency in how the sports are treated. It's our belief that if you ask coaches and, in many instances administrators, if they would like expanded brackets that increase opportunities for student-athletes, that there would be an affirmative response in most situations. Our belief is that even though this may look like a step backward because of the one year of a 64-team bracket with the play-ins, we don't want to encourage play-ins. Other sports will be looking at what's taking place in the sport of basketball and suggesting that if this is happening in basketball, why shouldn't it happen in volleyball,

why shouldn't it happen in soccer, why shouldn't it happen in softball? Based on our philosophy, it makes more sense to evenhandedly apply the principle of a ratio for all sports.

**Mr. Galaris:** You are right. It's only been one year that that was implemented. But it was not implemented until a poll was conducted of all the basketball coaches and athletics directors. My understanding was that it would be a play-in and they would be responsible for financing it. The question I asked as an athletics director is what's wrong with a play-in concept if we have to pay for it and we're in agreement with that? The sponsor of the basketball question had over 86 percent of the ADs and coaches favoring it.

**Stephen R. Bamford** (Plymouth State College): My question pertains to football and bracket expansion. I think the current ratio is 1 to 13. That certainly would support bracket expansion. As a football committee, we recognized that we don't want to extend the championship season another week, but what would the task force do? Would they support the notion if we reconfigure the season, reduced it by one game, started at the same time, ended at the same time during the regular season, and we reduced the number of contests during the regular season to nine? Wouldn't the task force support bracket expansion in football to 32 teams creating greater access to the NCAA Division III football championships?

**Mr. Bridges:** I can tell you that we would certainly consider that recommendation from the sports committee. I think there are a number of issues involved with the football playoffs. Would football coaches be willing to trade a week of the regular season for an extra week in the playoffs? Maybe some of my colleagues have a little more insight on this and can help me, but my understanding is that the difficulty with football is what's the next logical step? Do you then jump to 32 teams? Thirty-two teams would clearly put you beyond the ratio on the other end, I believe. So football is in a unique situation. But I guarantee you that that would be very seriously considered by the task force and then eventually by the Presidents Commission if that recommendation were to come forward.

**Ms. Sweet:** I do think that the task force is certainly willing to consider whatever suggestions either the sports committees or the membership would like to make, but I do want to point out a couple of things.

First, the Presidents Commission has stated that it would like to keep the championship postseason experience to no more than three weeks. But more importantly, I think it would be useful for the task force to know if there would be interest among the membership to reduce in-season competition opportunities in order to have an extended championship experience and, most importantly, is this really consistent with the Division III philosophy?

**Mr. Bamford:** If we reduce the playing season to nine regular-season games, we would not increase the number of championship dates in the postseason. They would stay at four. We would actually have 16 teams in there if we went to the bracket expansion of 32. But my committee has been hearing from the membership and the 199 schools that play football that there's very little accessibility to the Division III



play-off and they wanted to increase that accessibility in some way, shape or fashion. I would like to know how the football-playing membership feels about this kind of a proposal—whether or not they will want to increase access or whether or not they want to stay with the status quo.

**Timothy W. Gleason** (Ohio Athletic Conference): He mentioned football and the fact that it is unique. One of the concerns that we've been hearing is that because football plays fewer games, there's a likelihood that a team could be undefeated or just lose one game and not even get into the tournament. That's happened several times recently. A team loses once and they have no chance. If the committee would please consider that fact as well. Because of the small amount of contests played, you don't want a team that does lose once to not have a chance. I don't think that happens in any other

**Philip Godfrey** (Washington University, Missouri): I'm wondering if the committee was charged with any other responsibility other than bracket expansion. One thing that I would cite would be the men's and women's basketball officiating situation, which I understand has been a significant financial consideration and the reason why it's not been expanded.

**Mr. Bridges:** We did not consider that. We are still operating under the existing structure. I believe that would be a recommendation in the new structure that the sports committee would pass along for consideration to the new championships committee and eventually up to the Presidents Council. Many of us recognize that that is an issue that Division III needs to continue to deal with. We understand that's something that will keep coming up. I'm sure it will come up in different forms, but frankly, we haven't discussed that as a task force yet.

**Richard Kaiser** (Olivet College): I would like to have someone explain to me the rationale behind the two-quarter percent raise that we got, which equaled about \$500,000. Yet we chose to spend 80 percent of it on a sport that offered two separate championships in one season.

**Mr. Bridges:** Bob Williams is a former member of the track committee. I will ask Bob to respond to that.

**Robert E. Williams** (Swarthmore College): I would imagine the only explanation I could hang my hat on is the fact that we're working towards equity and that it is a legitimate championship—whether the athletes get two opportunities or one. It has remained for a long time the only legitimate championship that we have.

**Mr. Bridges:** Are there any other comments on track related to that last question?

**Daniel E. Wooldridge** (Old Dominion Athletic Conference): I have an answer to the previous question about basketball. This year there will be a new person in the Division III playoffs. There will be three persons officiating in the Division III men's basketball playoffs this year.

**Mr. Bridges:** That's clearly an issue that we will be dealing with in the future.

**Ray Hammond** (Centre College): I'm sure everyone appreciates all the work that the task force has done on this bracket and field-size study.

There are other issues about championships that need to be raised. The officials issue. I wonder if the task force has spent any time thinking in terms of criteria and how they are handled. As we navigate the challenging and confusing transition period, I urge those involved in the various championship-selection processes to reaffirm our commitment to clearly articulate selection criteria that keep fairness in the Division III philosophy paramount, that eliminate the political flaws and, perhaps most importantly, provide for a sensible recourse for an obvious and admitted error. For the selection process to be credible, it has to say precisely what we intend to do and then, even more critically, that we actually do what we say we intend to do. The Division III Championships Committee must be the diligent and conscientious forum for the discussion of these matters.

**Michael McCready** (Upper Iowa University): I applaud the task force for the efforts that it made in the individual sports. It seems this afternoon that football and basketball have come up a lot. The individual sports come together one time a year for a national championship. Their championships are usually one, two or three days at the most. We're not talking a period of weeks. I think that track is great. I think this is a step in the right direction. Indoor track and outdoor track are not the same sport. The events are different. I think it is a move in the right direction by expanding the swimming bracket size. I wish wrestling would have been looked at and expanded. I think that the Association needs to realize that we're more than football and basketball and that all the other sports are really legitimate opportunities that really need to be looked at. I hope that the task force will reaffirm the importance of the national championships of the individual sports and that those brackets will be expanded.

**Chuck Gordon** (Emory University): I would ask if one of the earlier people who asked about football is always willing to ask football-playing institutions to answer the question. As one of the 100-plus institutions in Division III that does not offer football, but does offer a broad-based program, I would ask that you include us in discussions related to football. I believe the label is Division III. The money is ours. Any consideration of expanding football brackets I think should include the 100-plus members of Division III that do not offer football.

**Donald Harnum** (Susquehanna University): As an institution that sponsors football, I would urge the committees to treat football somewhat differently. Those of us who are athletics directors with football programs know that we are constantly using the argument with our staffs, our administration and our student-athletes that football is a different type of animal to deal with for a variety of factors. One that one of my colleagues next to me just pointed out to me is that if you take the number of institutions that are sponsoring football and multiply that by the number of individual student-athletes who are on a team—it's approximately 200 institutions with an average of 80 student-athletes—you're looking at 16,000 young men who are participating in the sport of football. But if only 16 teams go, you've got about 1,200 or 1,300 who have the opportunity to participate in a national championship. I think we need to find a way to expand that bracket and make it work for Division III football simply on the basis of those



numbers.

**Don Tecklenburg** (Wilmington College, Ohio): I wonder if there's a couple of ways to think about the championships a little differently than we have. For example, on the football issue, one of the issues could be to form multiple divisions that are based on enrollment or some other method. This could allow you to still have an expanded field and yet not expand the number of playing dates in the tournament. That would be one option. In other team sports, particularly the issue raised in regard to the politicalization of selection, there might be a way in which you could play games with a qualifying process similar to international soccer. They have tournaments that go on throughout the season that result in a champion at the end of the season. It would be possible to set up your regular season schedule without expanding the number of games that you have and play institutions close to you in a tournament format. In doing that, you could actually have every single institution involved in the tournament championship. You could designate the third week of the season as the first round and then end up with your final three weeks participating in the championship. In that case, every single student would have the opportunity to participate in an NCAA championship event. Those first rounds would be your regular-season games. Those may be play-in games, but it might be an opportunity. It might be an idea to look at the championships a little differently than what we have historically done. It might allow more opportunity.

**Mr. Bridges:** I just want to make a couple of points. You will have plenty of opportunity to provide more feedback on this. We will be actively considering the discussion here and any other discussion that we may have in subsequent conference meetings. There's also some interest in distributing questionnaires to all of our institutions on a number of these issues. You will be kept very much up to speed on these issues and be given many more opportunities for input before any final decisions are made, I assure you.

**Kenneth J. Weller** (Central College, Iowa): I would like to make a comment that goes at the fundamentals of what we were discussing at the present time. I'm haunted by the fact that if you look at the history of Division I, many of its excesses and overemphasis have come from chasing a windfall of dollars. I find the mood of this meeting to be a similar kind of approach to this issue. Without having really been asked, a prior question was about an increased emphasis on postseason play. Is that in the best educational interests of our students? It may very well be. But it seems to me that we should have very careful consideration of what this major increase in the emphasis of sport in our institution does to our fundamental objective of integrating our academic and our athletics objectives. And I see in this rush to increase every championship and the enthusiasm of which we are all devising new and different ways to spend more money, a very serious threat in this transition period to what we have achieved in our division. (Applause)

**James E. Nelson** (Suffolk University): Dr. Weller's comments and the applause that he received take a little wind out of my comments. I am looking at the way one of our first speakers who mentioned the

men's and women's basketball increase and the thought of going back to 48 teams. We shouldn't try to place all the sports under the same brush and the same guidelines. Look at the numbers of participation where men's and women's basketball institutions are at 90-percent and 94-percent participation, respectively. We have a number of other sports that are 36, 56, 14 and 17. Obviously, there is a great interest in men's and women's basketball by the number of institutions that are sponsoring the sports. Men's basketball was fully funded, both in terms of transportation and per diem; the women in terms of transportation and partial per diem. The restructuring task force should not be hasty in terms of going back to a 48-team field. It should look at 64. It seems to be viable. We're hopeful that it would continue to go in that direction.

**Mr. Bridges:** One point of clarification that Judy just whispered to me. The basketball championships were 40 rather than 48. So in what may appear to be a cutback, we're actually not going all the way back on our recommendations in terms of funding. This still constitutes a funding increase even over what those standards were before we went to the 64-team tournament. It still equals a net increase and it doesn't go all the way back to 40, which is our previous funding level. Are there any other questions or comments?

**John M. Schael** (Washington University, Missouri): After we finish our session, what steps are followed by your committee to implement changes that we're talking about today? What is the procedure?

**Mr. Bridges:** As I understand it and as a past course, we've presented these recommendations as a preliminary report to our Presidents Commission representatives for their inspection prior to the presentation at the Convention.

In the transition year, the Presidents Commission will play a large role because it ultimately is going to make the decisions anyway once the restructuring takes effect. So basically, I think it's our position that what we are to do as a task force is firm up, work with the membership, listen to the membership, firm up our recommendations and then forward them to our current representatives on the Presidents Commission. I think we're going to defer to their judgment ultimately, although legislatively, I don't believe that that's mandated until the full restructuring legislation becomes effective. So, John, it is a little bit unclear. But in that transition period, the basic agreement we've worked out with the presidents is that we're going to give it our best shot in terms of making our recommendations and giving the presidents final authority to make the call on what our 1997-98 championships will look like. Thereafter, of course, the presidents will have that final decision legislatively because they will have the official authority to do so.

**Ms. Sweet:** There's an important part that Dan just mentioned that I want to underscore. We're probably not talking about these changes prior to 1997-98, unless the Executive Committee that currently is in place would support any recommendations that would go through that process. We are under the existing legislative rules for championships, which means reporting to the existing Executive Committee.

**Mr. Bridges:** Dan Dutcher made a good point here. We need to re-



mind you that we are still operating under existing rules until restructuring legislation becomes effective, which would be August 1997. We are still under the current NCAA guidelines rules. We're also working under the same or the existing funding format. So as Judy said, this would be dependent on the current Executive Committee providing us funding for any adjustments we might want to make before 1997. After 1997, we're free to do what we wish with our championships allotment.

**William F. Langston** (Rockford College): I thought I heard Judith say we have block money in the amount of about \$5 million. As projections go, I think I heard her say we would go to about \$7 million. If we are operating currently at about \$5 million, look at the different scenario. If they would take us from about \$5 million to \$6.1 or the low end—just over \$5 million—can we operate with a surplus? Where would the surplus go if there's money that is not being used for championships? Even if the programs we're looking at here range from basically a quarter of a million to just over a million increase, what would happen to some of that money? I don't know if I understand. We do operate right now at \$5 million and would go to \$7 million, did I misunderstand that? Where are we at?

**Mr. Bridges:** No. You understood that correctly. We have been given through the legislation that's passed today, assurances that the new moneys coming in will be ours to do what we wish with. So if we choose to bank \$1 million or \$2 million a year, that's fine. It is assumed that that surplus will be used to accommodate a certain amount of divisional growth in the future. As Judy mentioned earlier, the new Executive Committee will consider petitions for increased funding if at some point we grow beyond what those new dollars will allow us to adequately provide for our athletes or grow beyond our capability to provide our expanded membership reasonable championships opportunities. But in the interim, those are our dollars to keep. We will have a separate account and we do anticipate developing a surplus over the first few years of operation.

**Ms. Sweet:** I think there's an important clarification that we all need to be aware of. The guarantee of a 3.18 percent of Association budget is that, regardless of whether we have a \$1.8 billion television contract as currently exists. No one has a way of knowing what the next television contract is going to look like. While we all want to be optimistic and think that it's going to continue to grow, I don't think that we should be so naive to rule out the fact that, in fact, we may not be as fortunate as we have been in the previous two negotiations. So if the next round of negotiations result in a contract with less annual dollars, the dollars that would go toward our championship program will also decrease. One of the suggestions that has come forward is that we establish some kind of an endowment or some kind of a reserve in the event that there are some significant changes that work to our disadvantage in the future.

**Walter J. Johnson** (North Central College): I have two questions. I might have missed one earlier. How much did we actually spend from the \$5 million over the last year for national championships? That would give us some idea of whether or not we're working with the sur-

plus now or if we, in fact, are at our maximum. The second question is, at what point — because we're talking about championships now and expanding—can we talk about some other programs that might enhance the experience of our student-athletes that might, in fact, cost money? Is this a good time or should I wait?

**Mr. Bridges:** If you have suggestions, Walter, please make them now.

**Mr. Johnson:** Two suggestions. One, I would like us to look at a marketing strategy for Division III so we can let the general public know who we are in comparison to the other entities out there—Division I and Division II. That would indicate that we do something better than the other divisions—that is we keep an eye on the academic integrity of our programs and we keep the academic interest of our students at heart. I think there might be some merit in looking to a marketing program that would enhance that image for Division III specifically. That would be one thing. I also would like to see us put some funds into developing a way that we can have representatives from student-athlete councils at each one of our schools participate or at least be a part of the Convention specifically for Division III so that they can have some understanding as to what kind of issues are on the floor and we can be participants in the process.

**Mr. Bridges:** Thank you, Walter. I'll try to answer your first question. I'm going by memory now. I do have this data. If you are interested, I can present the exact numbers tomorrow morning. But I think the budgeted number for last year's championship for Division III was approximately \$5.3 million. I believe we spent about \$4.6 million. So we are already operating considerably under budget now. That has been factored in. The numbers that the oversight committee agreed upon originally—I believe it was 2.93 percent that was originally discussed as being the Division III allotment—was the \$5.3 million figure. So even if we had not negotiated for another .25 percent, we still would have been ahead of the game, given the current size of our championships and that sort of thing. So the difference between the actual cost of our championships and the allotment that we will actually be receiving at some point down the road is significant. It is our understanding, Walter, that if this membership chooses to spend some of those funds on programming other than championships, that we have every right to consider that and every right to do it. Those kind of suggestions have been mentioned in the past. I'm sure they will come back up for discussion.

**Chuck Gordon** (Emory University): I would like to also encourage the championships committee to explore cost savings. I know that we've been fortunate to participate in championships, but for long routes that we normally would fly for \$200, we'd receive championship tickets at \$700. We may be able to increase savings and have extra funds to spend by traveling more efficiently and more reasonably to some of our championships. We have been fortunate in hosting championships and have seen the disparity in the price of our tickets. Some people fly to New York for \$150 and some travel for \$700, depending upon the whims of the travel agency the NCAA uses. We may be able to see some real savings for expansion if we hunt for fares.



**Michael Heithaus** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Oberlin College): This is not on the subject of championships. However, since the issue of student-athlete representation was just brought up, I feel this is an appropriate time to make a few comments. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee would like to reiterate our belief that the student-athlete must maintain a voice in the restructured NCAA. For our voice to be heard, the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee needs access to the Management Council. We urge the transition team to include student-athletes as members and to seek input from the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. However, access at the national level is only a step toward including the opinions of the student-athlete. The voice of the student-athlete must start at the campus committees, which were mandated at last year's Convention. Finally, better organization at the conference level would be vital to transmitting the ideas for these campus committees to the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

**Walter Bowman** (Gordon College): I thought that a minute ago I heard Judy say that the recommendations that go to the Presidents Commission of 1997-98 will come from the restructuring committee. Maybe I misunderstood that. I guess my question is twofold. On December 15, we received this rather large document from the restructuring committee, of which there are 21 members. A couple of conferences out of those 21 members have at least two members from their conference on this committee. Are there recommendations that are going to go to the Presidents Commission relating to championship play, size of field, all of that? Are they going to come from the restructuring committee that has asked to stay in office until next year's Convention or are they going to come from the new restructuring committee, which I believe will have 27 members from both the Presidents and Management Council? That's one question. The second question is at what point are we able to make a comment about those committees and the overall makeup and membership?

**Mr. Bridges:** If those are transitional issues—this is another area where it's a little bit unclear—it's my understanding that the recommendations that will come forward from the task force will go to the Presidents Commission. Of course, we will get our current championships committee engaged in this discussion also. We're really trying to put together something that all three of those groups can agree on for this first interim year as a transition into the new restructuring package. So it hopefully will be a combined effort of the current championships committee, the current task force on restructuring and the current representatives of the Presidents Commission. That's who will deal with these immediate recommendations and make the decisions as to what our championships will look like in the initial year.

The other issue you raised is what happens after that? Who makes the recommendations to the president? How does this work? We will probably have some form of a championships committee. That is a transitional issue and that's something that will be discussed and worked on through this next year. But in the future, it is anticipated that this championships committee, which will be a subcommittee of the Management Council, will be charged with making recommenda-

tions and monitoring requests from various sports groups and that sort of thing, and then forwarding those recommendations through the Management Council to the new Presidents Council for any changes that the Management Council and the championships committee think might be in order.

**Thomas Hart** (Webster University): One of the byproducts of increasing the field of men's and women's basketball to 64 was the automatic berths for conferences that were included in the process of getting into the championships. If we are to go back to the field of 48 in the future, I would urge the championship committees to continue the progress that has been made in granting access to all conferences to have representatives in the tournament and in those championships.

**John M. Schael** (Washington University, Missouri): I heard the comment made earlier about dividing Division III into subdivisions. I would hope that we never come to that point in Division III. I hope that we're a part of Division III as a result of having athletics programs that stay within the philosophy of the institutions that we represent. I think what you see in Division I right now and Divisions I-A, I-AA and I-AAA, is part of the restructuring process. All of that will shake out in the future, but I hope that we stay as a unified organization in Division III. I don't think size has much to do with Division III. It can have a small institution and win national championships if that's your emphasis or you can be part of a great organization. That's just a comment.

The other is a recommendation or at least a consideration that has to do with this transitional period. One important factor is continuity as we move. As we move right now, we have the Council's and the Division III Steering Committee within that structure. It's very important that we have continuity as we move into the new management structure with the reorganized NCAA. Could some thought be given to those who are current members of the Division III Steering Committee carrying their appointments or their term of office into the new management structure so that if your term of office expires in 1999, they could be reelected as a member of the Management Council? Could we have the same thing for the presidents who are representatives of the steering committee right now?

**Mr. Bridges:** I believe that's intended, John. I think that those individuals who remain, who still have time on their terms as of 1997-98, will continue. Of course, there will be a number of new slots opened up, particularly on the Management Council, which is being expanded to 16. We will probably have about eight current steering committee members who will carry on and finish their terms in the new Management Council. But obviously, if there are eight current or existing members continuing on, that leaves eight new slots open. So there will be many opportunities for expansion and maintaining some continuity in that governing body. Similarly, we will do that on the Presidents Commission. I don't know exactly what the numbers are there, but I do think that that's the intention rather than "out with the old, in with the new" and having no continuity. I think that that was the original plan.

**Carlyle Carter** (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): It



was only 12 months ago that we decided that we were going to revise our Division III philosophy statement. When we try to impact any change in Division III, I think our philosophy statement should be the first thing that should be reviewed. In that philosophy statement under "I," we say, "give primary emphasis to regional in-season competition and conference championships" and in "J," we have "support athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletics performance, which may include opportunities for participation in national championships." May include, not a guarantee to be included in it. I would like to see some of our block-grant money used in the area of minority and women internships as well as postgraduate scholarships for our students. We have an opportunity now—given what we've just done this morning—to shape Division III in a manner in which we all have talked about. I just want to make sure that our actions follow our words.

**Mr. Bridges:** That certainly is the intention of the task force. We have discussed this very issue at virtually every task-force meeting. Every time we get together with our Presidents Commission representatives, we base our decisions and our discussions on our philosophy over and over again. So I'm sure that as we continue the transition into this new structure, I can assure you that the task force and the Presidents Commission representatives will keep a strong eye on our philosophy statement and our stated objectives as a membership and try to keep the membership focused on that as we make these transitional decisions.

**Susan Petersen Lubow** (U.S. Merchant Marine Academy): I'm standing here as secretary-rules editor for men's and women's swimming. I'm urging the task force to go back and talk again with the championships committee and asking the championships committee to go back and speak with people from the sports committee for swimming. Although I know your numbers are probably correct, they are really not indicative of what has occurred in swimming. I urge this body to do whatever it can to come up with the ability for the sports committee to have automatic-qualifying standards again and not have provisional standards. The way we are doing it right now, I personally do not believe is in the best interest of our student-athlete. We're doing it because we have a ratio that we must stay within. It's been very difficult. We've had student-athletes who have made it provisionally. They stay and train for their entire spring break just to find out at the end of their spring break that they did not make the NCAA championships. I'm urging the championships committee to speak with people who are extremely knowledgeable in this or see what we can do to go back to an automatic-qualifying time for the sports of men's and women's swimming. Thank you.

**Kenneth J. Weller** (Central College, Iowa): I would like to make just one quick follow-up to my comment earlier about what might be called a rush to expenditure and relate it to what Judy had to say about the possibility of establishing a reserve. I would like to urge the committee to take a very close look at what past revenues have been. For example, what would happen to our current championships if we were to return to the previous level of TV contracts? Take a very close

look at that and give very careful consideration to the possibility of establishing reserves so we can be assured of sustaining our current level of championships in the event of an untoward development in revenues.

**Mr. Bridges:** Good point. In conclusion, if you will look on the back page of that handout relative to funding, there are suggestions made on other possible ways of spending the fund on other than championships or creating a nice-sized reserve. If you look in the bottom right-hand corner where it says \$810,250. If we adopt the recommendations as stated here—which once again don't misunderstand me, this is not a done deal, I'm just using this for illustrative purposes—we would still realize a surplus in excess of \$1 million the first year out. So this will help put it in a little bit of perspective for you.

I think the task force and the championships committees are recommending that we land somewhere in the middle, that we make appropriate adjustments to our championships, that enhance opportunities for our student-athletes in those areas where it makes sense to do so and still try to maintain a reasonable or a substantial surplus for other needs that may come up in the future. So that's our current mind-set. As I mentioned time and time again, we will continue to listen to you through this transition year.

Speaking of transitions, we are now going to move into our second discussion topic.

**Mr. Coll:** I'm going to turn the meeting over now to Dick Rasmussen, a member of our task force and the Division III Council. I will let him introduce to you his panel and the topic that they are going to discuss with you today.

**Richard A. Rasmussen** (University Athletic Association): The first thing I would like to do is introduce the other members of our panel. We have Larry Schiner, director of athletics at Jersey City State; Rocky Carzo, director of athletics, Tufts University; John Harvey, the director of athletics at Carnegie Mellon University; and Linda Hopple, the executive director of the Middle Atlantic States Conference.

We're going to organize our presentation just a little bit differently. We have an outline of material that I'm going to attempt to walk everyone through and provide some explanation to some of the things that we're suggesting be considered. We're going to try to do it that way so that we don't break things up too much and lose the continuity of that part of the discussion. As I finish the outline, the other members of the panel will help to fill in areas that may need a little bit more clarification and we'll open it up for any questions that you may have.

Some of you may have been out of your seats as these materials were being distributed. You should have two handouts. One is a single sheet called "Division III and NAIA Membership Profile." That's basically a listing of the some of the information that we're providing, where it comes from and the definitions of some things that are coded or abbreviated. You also should have a page called "NCAA Division III Membership Profile and Statistical Summaries." You may refer to them as we work through some of this. We will be conducting two panels dealing with a number of different issues. We're going to try to



break them in half. There is some overlap, so our conversations may not be entirely separate.

During the last two years, we've had a number of conversations in these meetings and other forums where concerns over membership issues and championships issues with regard to Division III have been raised. Some of those concerns have been over the access to championships, the competitive equity within championship fields and the increase in the size of our membership, which could significantly change the profile of our division. For the most part, many of those conversations have taken place in the abstract. One of the things we hope to do today is to move that conversation out of the abstract and make it more hands-on, make the consequences of some of the options we might discuss more tangible. Several people have raised the point that many of the questions that have been asked in expressing these concerns present us with an opportunity. They present us with an opportunity to examine what we are and what we want to be. As we begin that conversation today, I would like to ask everybody to put our discussions and the considerations that you go through individually in the context of our Division III philosophy statement and to draw out of that context several points. One is that our philosophy statement speaks to the concept of broad-based athletics programs. It also speaks to equity in our athletics programs for men and women. It speaks to maximizing participation among the students in our student bodies. It talks about treating student-athletes like other students and holding them to the same standards and expectations. It also speaks of an emphasis on regional and conference competition.

The other thing I would like to ask everyone to do is to consider that although we all have a responsibility to our own institutions and our own conferences, we also have a responsibility to the division as a whole. It's up to you individually how you balance those responsibilities. But I think it's very important to consider not just the perspective of your own institution. We need to step into the shoes of other people and consider perspectives from a wider range because we are charged with doing something that affects the division as a whole, not just our own institutions. There are several issues that we hope to cover on this panel and the following panel. The first two covered in this panel have to do with the process through which new members are admitted into Division III. The second will be Division III membership requirements specifically focusing on sports sponsorship. In the panel following this one, we'll focus more on the availability and access to postseason competition. Our goals this afternoon are to suggest approaches that we think may address the concerns that have been voiced by the membership and to suggest approaches that are consistent with the principles embodied in our philosophy statement. As I mentioned before, we want to move the conversation from the abstract to the real to provide the information that you need to facilitate an informed discussion of the issues and the options available to us.

Our final goal is just to listen, to be open-ended with regard to the direction this takes and to realize that, as many people have said today, this is a beginning, this is a first step. This isn't an end result. The types of things we're trying to provide to you today to assist in

this effort include a number of things. We're providing you with a profile of Division III institutions and some information about what we look like in the aggregate. We're providing you with information on provisional membership and the NAIA membership as well. We'll also provide you with some options and we hope to provide you with the implications of following those options to their logical conclusions. For example, if we raise sports sponsorship requirements, how many of our institutions are going to be affected, how would they be affected? If we subdivide it, who would my institution end up being grouped with? Things like that.

To begin with, I would like to direct your attention to the profile summaries that we distributed. We're presenting you the profile information because of the membership's concerns about division growth coming primarily from the NAIA. We're trying to provide information on what the number of potential members might be, the types of programs that they sponsor and the potential that those institutions have to change the profile of Division III to something different than what it is today if they come in in large numbers. There also are a number of concerns that have been expressed about the degree of diversity among institutions within Division III—the range of sizes of institutions, the range of numbers of sports that are sponsored, the types of students or pools from which our institutions draw students. What we're trying to do with this information is to provide you with a picture of what these things look like, both for the current members and also for the NAIA membership. In terms of looking at the charts that were provided to you, we've provided cross-tabulations that list information for Division III schools, provisional members and members of the NAIA who are classified in their Division I and their Division II. They include tables referring to admission difficulty, which gives us some measure of the type of students that institutions are drawing their student populations from. That is also an indication of admission difficulty in various institutions.

If you are looking to understand where these category come from, noncompetitively, difficulty, so on. If you refer to the other index, there is an explanation of how those figures are arrived at. It's information that is self-reported by the institutions. That's where that is drawn from. The other tabulations include cross-tabulations about how institutions are distributed among our districts geographically, how they are distributed by state and private status, and what the distribution is for sports-sponsorship level. For undergraduate enrollment, an index called the Ankrom index, was introduced last year, which is a combination of sports sponsorship and undergraduate enrollment distribution with regard to the total number of sports sponsored and the student-to-sport ratio at different institutions.

We will also be providing you with a copy of the database from which these cross-tabulations are drawn. We will provide you with institution-by-institution profiles for all of our 390 or so members and provisional members and also for about 315 or so NAIA members. So, you will be able to look at that information this evening before you come back tomorrow morning and continue this discussion.

I would offer a couple of comments about both the limits and the



usefulness of this data. First of all, the age of the data, some of this data are a few years old. We began some of these conversations two years ago and some of that information reaches back that far. It does come from third-party sources. It doesn't come directly from your institutions to us. It might very well look a little bit different today than what was collected or it might look different if it were coming directly from you. Overall, though, I feel that the information is fairly accurate. There are going to be errors throughout it, but when taken in the aggregate — and I emphasize that — I think it gives us a reasonable picture about where we are. I would encourage you to keep it in that context. It is not intended to be a final measure. It is not intended to be the type of measure that would place you in one division or another. That's not what it is. If we choose to go in that direction at some point in time, that data or that information will be collected directly from your institutions and on the spot. I also have a couple of comments about analysis of cross-tabulation. I'm not going to try to get into too much detail with this because I would urge you to look at it and draw your own conclusions rather than be biased by what I see in there or what any of us up here on the dais see in it, but I would offer a couple of comments in general.

When you take a look at the membership of the NAIA and NCAA Division III, you will see a significant amount of overlap. You will see institutions in the NAIA that look very much like institutions in Division III. You will also see a significant amount of difference. You will see institutions in both divisions that look very different from the divisions in the other organization. That doesn't necessarily make a judgment that one type of institution is better than another or not. It simply means that there are different types of institutions that we're dealing with.

As you look at the NAIA membership, there is no good correlation between divisional status of the NAIA and Divisions II and III within the NCAA. You can't make that correlation. If you start looking institution by institution, it doesn't hold up. So in terms of looking at this in the worst-case scenario, you could be looking at every NAIA division being a potential Division III member. I will qualify that and say that's not very likely, but you can't do a straight comparison of NAIA Division I is a Division II NCAA institution, and NAIA II is a Division III institution. That's just not the case. I would also note that when you look at sports-sponsorship levels among the NAIA institutions, more than a third of those institutions would not meet our current membership requirements for entry into Division III.

Another broad quality that I think you notice about the NAIA schools is fairly obvious. The NAIA schools tend to be very small. When you are looking at the profiles of the NCAA Division III institutions and the NAIA institutions, there are some implications that I think we can draw regarding the potential dissolution of the NAIA or what would happen to that institution if that organization did not continue to function. I would suggest that the profile indicates that the dissolution of the NAIA is very definitely an Association-wide problem for a couple of reasons. The profile indicates that what we would be looking at is more than likely the creation of a whole new division, not

necessarily absorption of those institutions into Division III. When you look at the profiles and look at the types of institutions, the kinds of philosophies and programs, it's very different in a lot of instances than what we offer and would require. I would think that they would want an approach to the organization that's probably different than the approach that we would want, and that calls for the Association as a whole taking a look at quite possibly an entirely new division. So with that, I would like to move on to the membership issues specifically and the options that we're going to present for the application process for new membership requirements.

In terms of the application process for new members, we're looking at an enhanced membership application procedure. The rationale for this is based on a desire to ensure that new members would conduct their programs in a manner that's consistent with the Division III philosophy. We want to ensure that potential members have a commitment to that philosophy and that they are not just looking for a financial solution or some other short-term gain and that they really are engaging our divisional philosophy statement in terms of how they operate their programs.

The proposal that we would offer for consideration in that regard has five parts to it. One, we would increase the provisional membership period from three to four years. The rationale for that is that the increase would provide a little longer time for self-study and to bring the institution into compliance with our regulations, philosophy and approach to athletics. Another reason is that it would ensure that the first generation of student-athletes from that institution participating in Division III would be recruited under Division III guidelines and subject to Division III guidelines from the beginning. So, the first suggestion is increasing the provisional membership period to four years.

The second suggestion would be to require every provisional member to complete an institutional self-study guide during the first year of their provisional status. Again, that would help ensure that they would engage the Division III philosophy statement and also that they would become more familiar on a day-to-day basis with Division III standards and rules. So, completion of the institutional self-study guide is the second point.

The third point would be a campus site visit and evaluation by representatives of our Management Council or some subcommittee of our Management Council that would provide an external review of the self-study process that that provisional member was undertaking.

Our fourth suggestion tied to that would be the assessment of an application fee, the majority of which would be tied to covering the expense of a site visit by an evaluation team. Again, this is something that would to some degree force the question about how serious the institution is about membership and how serious they are with compliance, with what we would ask of them.

The fifth point in our proposal would be to require compliance with all requirements and any recommendations made by a site visit team by the conclusion of the provisional period. So you would have a four-year period. The first year, they would complete the institutional self-study guide. The second year, they would receive a peer review site



visit and receive recommendations. In the third and fourth years they would have the opportunity to bring those recommendations into operation and practice. At the conclusion of the fourth year, they would be taken up for consideration as full members of Division III. So those are our proposals with regard to the membership application process.

The second topic that we wanted to deal with is our membership requirements, specifically the possible increase in sports-sponsorship level. When we look at our philosophy statement, it speaks to broad-based athletics programs. It also speaks to maximizing participation by students in the student body. If we were to do this, the membership might choose to increase sponsorship levels to five men's sports and five women's sports from the four and four we now have or to six and six or to seven and seven. I direct your attention to the green sheet, which is the last page of the handout. That will show you directly just exactly how many of our institutions would be affected if we made that type of change. The first table at the top deals with current Division III members. The second table deals with our current provisional members. The table at the bottom looks at our combined membership of current members and provisional members. If you look at the total of our provisional and current members, if our sports sponsorship level was increased to five and five, 64 of our members have sponsorship levels lower than that, or about 16 percent of our membership. If we raised it to six and six, we would be affecting 128 of our current members, or about 32 percent of our membership. If we raised it to seven and seven, that number would increase to 172 institutions that would have to make additions to their programs to come into compliance with new membership criteria. That's about 43 percent of our membership. We did not provide tabular information on the NAIA for this. We wanted to focus on the effect of our own members. But by way of comment, you can draw those conclusions for yourself by looking at the other charts and summarizing. A membership requirement of five and five would affect 50 percent of the members in the NAIA, a six and six requirement would affect two-thirds of the NAIA members, and the membership requirement of seven and seven would affect 80 percent of the NAIA membership. So those are the implications of looking at changes in sports sponsorship requirements. It's been suggested that I give you the NAIA numbers again. If we raise the sports sponsorship level to five and five, it would affect about 50 percent of the NAIA members. That's about 167 NAIA members. Raising it to six and six would affect 215 out of the 315 NAIA members. That's about 67 percent, about two-thirds. That's not using a calculator, that's just a thumbnail sketch we're looking at. Raising it to seven and seven would affect 255 NAIA members, and that's around 80 percent.

We're also suggesting that in addition to looking at the sports sponsorship requirement, we perhaps look at requiring institutions to sponsor at least three team sports for men and three team sports for women. So if our membership requirement was five and five, three of those men's sports would have to be team sports and three of those women's sports would have to be team sports. The rationale for that is that if our philosophy says we're looking at an emphasis on participation, it's more likely that the participation level will be higher in a

team sport than in many of the individual sports. Now, that may not be true across-the-board with every sport. But you can sponsor a track team. In some cases, when you look at some of the applications we get, there are five and six people on a track team. If you have a soccer team, you have to field a soccer team. You can't field a soccer team with five or six people. The same with some other sports. So that's another thing you may want to consider.

There's a question about requiring current members to comply with an increased membership standard. It's the feeling of the task force that the answer to that is probably "yes," but it is an open-ended question. We suggest that there be an appeal process for current members, recognizing that there may be extenuating circumstances that prevent an institution from reaching the sports-sponsorship level that we would require. Geography, weather, demographics, the breakdown of men and women in the institution, your profile of men and women in the institution, may make it easy for you to meet the standard in men's sports but not in women's sports. It would take into account if it's an engineering school that historically has a very low percentage of women, things like that.

We would also suggest that the effective date for current members complying with any change in the standards be a period of four years, which would make it the same as the proposed provisional membership period. These standards would be applied to current members and to the provisional members; however, if we were to change the length of provisional membership status, that change would not apply to current provisional members. The current length of provisional members status is three years and that would remain regardless. We could not change that retroactively.

That takes us through the end of the suggestions that we have. The suggestions refer to both the enhanced membership application process, which includes the four-year provisional period, completing the self-study during the first year, a site visit during the second year, a membership fee to cover the cost of a site visit and compliance with recommendations from the peer review team by the end of the four-year period, as well as membership requirements that consider the possibility of increasing the membership requirement for men's and women's sports sponsorship from four to five, six or seven. Included in those suggestions is the possibility of requiring sponsorship of three team sports for men and three team sports for women and providing a petition process for exceptions to that when there are circumstances beyond the control of the institution.

So with that said as background of what we're suggesting in this particular area, I would ask other members of the panel to fill in gaps or offer any comments and then we'll open it up to questions. The consensus is that the panel would like to open it up and react to questions. I should add that another option to all of this is to do exactly what we're doing right now. We don't have to change for the sake of changing. Keeping what we have in place is also an option.

**John D. Galaris** (Salem State College): I have wondered for a number of years what was meant by broad-based participation. To me, it's always been something of an abstract journal. I'm wondering if the



committee has given any thought to the number of sports sponsored based on the population of the institution. By way of example, if I'm a 10,000-member institution and I sponsor four and four, I might view that very differently in terms of broad-based consideration as opposed to the institution that has 600 students and is sponsoring four and four. I just don't know if the committee has thought on those terms at all.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** I think this is an excellent suggestion, John, because it really does make a difference.

**James E. Nelson** (Suffolk University): I'm certainly appreciative of the concern and thoughtfulness that the committee had in looking at sports sponsorship. At a number of our meetings, I have been an advocate of caution in terms of the minimum sport requirement since I'm with an institution that has struggled with that particular aspect of membership. I've found from my comments that my institution is not alone. Because of geography—and by that, I mean urban institutions that lack facilities, in particular external facilities—you may have some difficulty in achieving increased sports-sponsorship or going beyond five, six or seven. Also, many of our institutions are in fiscal constraints that inhibit additional sports. Are you enhancing the ones that we presently have in light of the shrinking traditional student population? Many urban areas have student populations with ages of 28, 29 and 30, whose interests are quite different from that of 18- to 22-year-olds. So I would just like to say I'm appreciative of the concern that I have heard from this task force. Thank you.

**John H. Harvey** (Carnegie Mellon University): I would like to respond a little more to Jim Nelson's points, which were the same ones he made last summer at the NACDA meetings. I have mentioned in our meetings this fall about restructuring—and I really feel that I'm not alone on the committee in feeling this—that so far, none of the particular membership requirements in themselves that we mentioned seem to be without difficulties and completely sensitive to all of the variables that we find among member institutions. This is to suggest that the whole discussion about the possibilities or combinations of requirements for membership in Division II is still very much a live one. We have suggested a number of alternatives here. I would say that we don't strongly agree with those alternatives as they are in themselves because each of them seem to eliminate some schools that really ought to be in another category and so forth. So I really encourage people to continue to be even more creative as far as combinations of requirements, such as John Galaris mentioning the combination of enrollment and sports sponsorship, which John Biddiscombe has brought up in the past. These are very difficult suggestions that we get into and they are not without some political significance when people talk about the difference between public institutions and private institutions. So I think the game is really wide open here. To me, none of these alternatives is perfect yet.

**John M. Schael** (Washington University, Missouri): Can we as an organization put in a seven-plus-seven rule for sports sponsorships that would just apply to new members? Are existing members within the NCAA division restructure grandfathered in and/or are they ac-

cepted as full-fledged members?

**Mr. Rasmussen:** Our subcommittee that examined this issue talked about that. Our reaction is that it would probably be very difficult to have one standard for new members and another standard for existing members. There may be some legal implications about that. But the other reason that we felt that we would suggest that the same standard be applied to both is that the concerns that have been expressed by the membership haven't just been about new schools coming in. The concerns have been expressed about the membership of the division itself. So if there's a rationale for that sort of standard, it should be a rationale that would apply to everyone in the division as opposed to just being a gatekeeper to the division.

**Mr. Schael:** I understand that, but I think in the past, transitions were made. For example, you had a Division I program in one sport, but you had Division III program in all other sports. They gave you a waiver to maintain your membership at that Division I level. It's my understanding that you can't do that today. Why couldn't you apply the same type of philosophy? What if you proposed a seven-plus-seven in terms of sports sponsorship, but yet you've made a waiver for all existing members who are in the NCAA Division III structure at this particular point in time.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** I think we could consider it when we have our conversations within our smaller group. Our feeling was tendered in the other direction. But as we've said before, it's an open-ended question. If the membership feels strongly about that, then that's where we can go. There may or may not be legal implications on that.

**Jenepher P. Shillingford** (Bryn Mawr College): I think it's time for me to confess that I failed both graphs and flow charts in college. So let me be a little more simplistic. I think — and this has been expressed previously — that what we really need to do is to make sure that our membership mirrors our philosophical profile. I think that's very difficult. That is where we've had a great deal of difficulty. In terms of all of the criteria that we've talked about and many more, John mentioned enrollment. You could also mention state and private, you could mention tuition, you could talk about urban/suburban. But I think they have to mirror what our philosophy says, and John has a good point. What is a broad-based program? Maybe we have to define that in terms of what the membership thinks broad-based is. So I think there's a lot of work to be done here in terms of this restructuring committee. We will need to lean very heavily on your thoughts, just what John has said. A number of people have given us some good ideas. We're going to need a lot more. How do we measure and evaluate what we're going to do in terms of our philosophy? Otherwise, why have the philosophy? We've called ourselves the conscience of the NCAA all these years. I always thought it was only Division III that believed that. But if indeed we are that, then we really do have to live within the boundaries of the philosophy, so we always have to go back to that.

**Laurie Priest** (Mount Holyoke College): Jen, I couldn't agree with you more about the philosophy. I know that this body is very much committed to gender equity. I'm wondering if there was any sort of dis-



cussion among your group about looking at schools that come into Division III and what their current status is in relation to gender equity or what their plan is to move towards that? I know many of our members are struggling and working towards that. Was that considered at all or would you consider adding that?

**Ms. Hopple:** We thought that that could be a part if we could include a visit to the campus. If a school wants to become a Division III member, that would be a part of the study of where they are with gender equity when we visit that campus. The other part, which very obviously speaks to gender equity, would be the team-sport ratio, which was three for men and three for women. But that's a good point. We probably should pursue that area in more depth.

**Joseph T. Walsh** (Emerson College-Massachusetts College of Art): While I echo Jim Nelson's sentiments from Suffolk, I look at the statistics and it's difficult to justify that only about 16 percent of us sponsor the minimum sports. It seems as though the rest of the schools are on an upward climb and we're sort of holding on. I wondered if the committee looked at the types of unique situations that we might have, like a performing arts school or other schools that offer unique curriculums or have urban students or nontraditional students who are older. I wondered if there's discussion about the possibility of maybe a Division IV or a III-A for those schools who would want to stay at that level or not only want to stay, but have no choice because of the student body. I think it does go beyond the minimum. Inadvertently, we're going to eliminate some opportunities for schools like mine.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** I think our committee is very sensitive to that issue and would offer a couple of comments in that regard in terms of looking at this. That's one of the reasons why we would suggest some sort of petition process, because there are circumstances like that where the definition of a broad-based program have a different effect. Sponsoring four, five or six sports at one institution may be very different or may be much more difficult from one institution than another. So we need to have some means of looking at things on a case-by-case basis. As we get into the discussion in our second session, I think we're going to find that when we start looking at criteria, there aren't criteria that are easily white and black, that don't have gray areas, that won't very easily become arbitrary. I think we've got to be very careful about that.

**Frank J. Rotunda** (Stevens Institute of Technology): I represent an independent athletics conference that is a small group of schools with limited women enrollment in various urban-type environments. I'm somewhat concerned. We talk about diversity. It seems to me this issue is one that has something to do with trying to preeliminate a number of NAIA schools that would come into this organization. I would be very concerned that we would be able to see one current member be affected by an increase in the number of sports sponsorships. I would not want to see one affected in a negative way for the purpose of limiting NAIA sports.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** That was an excellent point.

**John H. Harvey** (Carnegie Mellon University): That is a real sensitive issue. I think a lot of us agree that we are trying to construct crite-

ria that would put institutions in the levels that we think they ought to be in. I will throw another difficult question into this and see if there's any response this year. There wasn't last year when we introduced the topic. Is anyone in Division III interested in minimum academic requirements for being in this division? I personally am not. I think that is a kettle of fish that we really don't want to get into. I think it would be very difficult for the initial-eligibility clearinghouse to determine academic standards for entrance into a division. However, that is a suggestion. You hear a lot of comments among members as to what institutions they would like to see included in Division III, or more importantly, what institutions they don't think ought to be in Division III. Some of them get back to academic qualifications of those institutions. To me, that's such a difficult thing to determine and such a sensitive issue that I hesitate to really think further along that line. However, I wanted to see if any members have thought that that also ought to be added to the variety of ideas that we're thinking about as far as membership criteria. I often look to my left to the designated hitter, John Galaris, who comes to the floor a lot of times when nobody is at the microphone. But are there any responses to the idea of academic minimums for membership?

**Rocco J. Carzo** (Tufts University): John, I would like to eliminate all the academic requirements.

I got up because I'm struck about what we heard, particularly this afternoon in our Division III round tables and discussions about criteria. We have the possibility of taking an inordinate amount of time to solve a problem that is almost impossible to solve. Let me tell you what I mean. I think our philosophical posture—the way we've expressed it is a very broad, encompassing statement that allows for the beauty of Division III—comes from the diversity that we all treasure so much. It also has provided us an opportunity to participate in championships. We know, however, if that becomes expanded by adding many more members, that we will decrease the opportunities for participation and displace people as we attempt to proceed toward championships. I think that it's become obvious in our committee that our strongest assets in Division III have become our liabilities. We have to use a very sound way and take some time to think through the ways. John Schael mentioned how we are preserving the waiver process for those schools who could not meet the requirements but yet have been in Division III for the last 10 or 15 years. Do we just exclude them by writing in criteria? No, we have to use some sound judgment.

I think we have to realize that we have to spend more and more time to get more input to help us keep on a straight course.

**Mr. Coll:** That's a good way to end, Rocky. Thank you, Dick, and members of the panel.

We are moving toward the closing hour. I know David Carter has some comments that he would like to share with you before we adjourn today. But let me remind you that the general business session will begin promptly at four this afternoon. We will conclude our legislative session and then return again to Division III restructuring and reorganization. So take an opportunity this evening to study all of those wonderful materials that Dick Rasmussen and the task force



have provided for you. Consider some questions and suggestions you might want the task force to take away from this Convention to work on for the next six months. We will give you as much time as you need tomorrow morning to continue to move through this topic.

President Carter, would you please come up and share some remarks with us before I adjourn our meeting.

**David G. Carter** (Eastern Connecticut State University): Thanks, President Coll. I shall try to be brief. Tomorrow, one year ago, we were together. If you recall the setting, we were somewhat alarmed and cantankerous because we thought we were being forced to make a decision. How refreshing it is, due to the work of a superb task force and an excellent steering committee, that we came out of it, in my judgment, much the better. This past year I found myself away from my campus a little over 30 days and participating in conference calls for three hours, but it was worth it. I would like to take a minute, because I won't be here tomorrow, to say on behalf of the Presidents Commission, "thanks," Ed. Thanks to your board of trustees, to your faculty for allowing you to be away much more than I was away and for getting us more than we would have gotten if you had not been involved. Ed Coll took numerous beatings from presidents while representing your interests. In the final analysis, we grew and learned a great deal. To Dan Bridges and Jim Appleton, we commend them as well. This morning you did indeed make me proud when you said you believed in what the task force had to say about restructuring. I say to you that we heard you loud and clear. The task force and members of the Presidents Commission will meet within 10 weeks to do a post-Convention analysis and develop an agenda for what we must work on during the course of the year. You've talked about two issues that are very, very important. President Weller so rightly said to us, "be prudent." He cautioned us because now we are responsible for our own house. The bank book that we have is ours, the checks that we write come from our own account. We must be diligent and at the same time meet those things that we're committed to, like gender equity. We should seriously consider championship expansion if we can afford it. We must wrestle with the issue of membership, as difficult as it is, because we cannot continue five years from now grappling with membership the way we've been grappling with it at least for the five years that I've been involved. We must reach closure. There are numerous other issues that we will have to tackle. But most of all, we must stay true to that we believe are core values, what separates us from the rest. I say to you, "thanks." Thanks for your support in the task force report and in the restructuring. Thanks for your willingness to put forth time. As I said yesterday, more time will be asked of you because more needs to be done. This is our house now. We must maintain it. We must keep it in shipshape. As I leave, I would like you to join me in just saying to you, Ed, thanks for a job well done. (Applause)

**Mr. Coll:** Thank you, President Carter. Those were very generous remarks. I must say that you certainly deserve your share of recognition and appreciation from this group for all of the hard work that you have done right along side of me with the Commission. We are in your debt.

I have an announcement here that says we need to announce that the window for reconsideration is closed. I don't know if we need to announce it, but the window for reconsideration is closed.

You have a new handout. I'm told that Dick Rasmussen has three more handouts. What are you going to walk us through, Dick?

**Mr. Rasmussen:** There are a series of handouts that will be used to guide our discussion of the championship issues, which we'll get into tomorrow morning. It's the type of thing that will be helpful to walk through. I think it would be the type of thing that might be useful for you to have overnight to take a look at. There are a couple of things. There will be a handout coming around that has a pink cover sheet. That will show you when we get into the topic of potential subdivisions, how that might play out. There's also a lavender-colored sheet that is just a summary of some of the things that we've been talking about in the discussion that you may have to refer to. The two tables in the back are the institution-by-institution profiles that I spoke about earlier. If you would like, please take one of those on the way out. You also should have a blue sheet coming around and a packet with a pink cover sheet. Take those with you. Those will be used in the discussion tomorrow morning. Thank you.

**Mr. Coll:** Thank you, Dick. Are there any other special announcements that need to be made at this particular meeting before I adjourn? If there is no further business to conduct today, we will declare the meeting adjourned. Thank you all. Make certain you have your handouts and we will see you tomorrow morning.

[The Division III business session adjourned at 3:26 p.m.]

## Tuesday Morning, January 9, 1996

The Division III business session was reconvened by Mr. Coll at 8:16 a.m.

### OPENING REMARKS

**Mr. Coll:** Will the delegates please take their seats?

Good morning to all of you. We are delighted to welcome you again to the Division III business session. Today's agenda is listed on page nine of the Convention Program.

Our first item of business today is a report from the Division III Championships Committee. Second, we will consider the remaining legislation pertaining to Division III. Those are Proposals Nos. 43-J, 56, 73, 83, 99-D, E, F, G and H, 123 and 124. These will all be paddle votes and should not take a great deal of time to consider. Proposals 43-I, 44 and 105-A, which we were originally to consider today, have been withdrawn. After that, we will continue the discussion of the Division III restructuring issues that we began yesterday. We still have some important issues to talk about, including methods of subdividing the division as well as a survey to distribute. We will elect new Division III members to the Council as well as a new Division III vice-president. Finally, we will discuss any other topics of interest to the delegates. We are scheduled to adjourn at noon, but I think we will be done well before that unless you have other items of business that you wish to introduce to the agenda.



Our first item of business is to receive the report of the Division III Championships Committee. To give this report, I am happy to introduce Mary Barrett, associate director of athletics at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, and the committee chair.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

### Championships Committee

**Mary Barrett** (University of Massachusetts, Boston): Thank you. On behalf of the Division III Championships Committee, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for four wonderful years of serving as chair of this committee. This Convention marks the end of my term on the championships committee. I know that the chair and the committee will continue in very good hands. I would like to recognize the committee that served you this year. Sam Bedrosian, the director of athletics at Central College; Dan Bridges, whom you met yesterday, the director of athletics at California Institute of Technology; Bob Williams, the director of athletics at Swarthmore College; and Ed Coll, the president of Alfred University. Ed is also completing his term on the committee. We appreciate all of the time and energy that he has spent in working on behalf of the championships committee.

As you may be aware, the Division III Championships Committee meets three times a year and is responsible for the review of recommendations submitted by sports and rules committees as they relate to the administration of the Division III championship program. The actions of the committee are published in *The NCAA News* after each meeting. Therefore, I will not take the time this session to summarize all of the actions, but I would like to highlight some of the points that took place this year.

During the 1994-95 academic year, a total of 8,329 student-athletes competed in 24 Division III championships, compared to 7,581 the previous year. The increase was the result of a playing format approved for men's and women's basketball. Also, more than 68 percent—a pretty good number—of the Division III members had at least one student-athlete competing in an NCAA championship, an increase of three percent from the previous year. The success of the championship program is dependent upon willingness and ability of our member institutions to host events.

At this time, I would like to ask anybody in the room who had any hosting opportunities this year in any round to stand so that your colleagues can acknowledge your contribution. (Applause)

Monitoring the changes in sports sponsorship and assisting the Division III Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure were the focus of the committee's work during the past year. As you know from yesterday's discussion, many of the restructuring issues are related to access to championships. The committee has played an active role in providing information and feedback to the task force. In addition, the committee has responded to changes in sports sponsorship by supporting the legislation to establish a Division III women's golf championship. It also has asked the women's soccer committee to forward a recommendation to expand the Division III soccer championship from 20 to 24 teams. Yesterday when the restructuring task

force panel was held, you may have noticed that on your report there were some differences in terms of what your championships committee had recommended as compared to what the task force was recommending. This is especially true. I encourage all people during the next year, which is going to be a very important year in terms of working out details, to let your thoughts as a member of Division III be known to the appropriate groups.

During the coming year, the committee will work within the new government structure in implementing changes in the championship program. It will be an exciting and challenging year. The committee looks forward to working with the membership to provide reasonable expansion without increasing the demands of the student-athletes in terms of their time or in compromising their competitive integrity in the event.

As always, your suggestions to improve the championship program are welcome by the championships committee. Your correspondence is read. Many valuable suggestions are forwarded to us. We are able to make adjustments when people point out to us that there are things that need to be attended to. So we welcome hearing from you. Your comments are certainly always welcome. If you have any questions regarding any action taken by the committee, I would ask you to forward your comments to any committee member, to the new committee chair or to Donna Noonan at the NCAA office. Once again, I appreciate the opportunity to have served you. I look forward to continuing success in Division III. Thank you. (Applause)

**Mr. Coll:** Thank you so much, Mary. As you probably know, Mary concludes her service to the Executive Committee and also the championships committee. She really was a terrific colleague and I enjoyed my opportunity to work with her.

Before we start voting on the legislative proposal, I feel compelled to extend to you an apology. I was invited to the athletics directors reception last night for Division III by Dick Rasmussen. While you were meeting and enjoying yourself, I was sitting in my room reading the newspaper. When I awoke this morning to organize the events of the day, I came across Dick's invitation and was startled to find out it was last night and not tonight. So in typical fashion, this president is also sometimes a day late and a dollar short, so I apologize very much. I was looking forward to attending that reception to thank some of you personally who have been so helpful to me over the past couple of years, and I am genuinely sorry that I missed it.

Let us move now to our legislative proposals. Again, we are going to vote by paddle. If we have any close votes on any of these issues, we will try again to see if our computer is working. I'm told in "computerese" that the computers work when you are not here. When you show up, the new carpeting that was put on the floor generates so much static electricity that it does something to the system. That's a very creative explanation. Since I barely have walking-around sense about computers, I pass it on to you without any comment.

We will start first with Proposal No. 43-J.



## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

### De Minimus Violations—

#### Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes

**Linda S. Moulton** (Clark University, Massachusetts): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to eliminate the ineligibility component of current legislation that affects the prospect's or student-athlete's eligibility when an institutional official violates one of these pieces of legislation. Violations of this legislation do not result in a benefit being provided to a prospect or student-athlete and the institution seldom gains a recruiting or competitive advantage. It is important to know, however, that all violations of NCAA rules, including those in this proposal, must be reported to the NCAA. One or more of the penalties outlined in Bylaw 19.6.1 will continue to be imposed upon the institution and institutional employees. The only difference is that we won't affect the eligibility of innocent prospects or student-athletes. You will notice that there is a correction to letter J of this proposal. The modification of this legislation should indicate that when a prospect's official visit extends beyond the 48-hour limitation due to inclement weather, the violation does not affect the prospect's eligibility.

The Eligibility Committee believes that this proposal is an effective and positive step toward deregulation of the many violations that currently affect the prospect's or student-athlete's eligibility. The Eligibility Committee strongly supports this proposal. I urge your support as well.

[Part J of Proposal No. 43 (Page A-122) was adopted.]

#### Eligibility for Practice—Minimum Full-Time Enrollment—

#### United States Olympic Committee/National Governing Body Waiver

**G. Larry James** (Richard Stockton College of New Jersey): I move adoption of Proposal 56 on behalf of the Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

As a member of this committee, I ask your full support of Proposal No. 56. Because of the tremendous support in strengthening the relationship between the NCAA and the U.S. Olympic Committee, this proposal was formulated by the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee at the request of the USOC and NCAA task force. That specifically appointed task force, cochaired by Ced Dempsey and USOC Vice-President George Steinbrenner, expressed serious concern regarding NCAA regulations that discouraged Olympic athletes from using an institution's athletics facilities.

One of the suggestions of this task force has been that the USOC should not continue to build new training centers when first-class facilities exist at our colleges and universities. The limited exception that would be created by Proposal 56, which is intended primarily for former student-athletes who have completed their intercollegiate eligibility, would help to match NCAA resources with USOC needs. The task force views this proposal as very significant since the USOC in re-

turn is considering financial assistance to NCAA institutions in all three divisions to assist with support of endangered as well as emerging Olympic sports. The Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee both strongly support this proposal. I, as an Olympian, urge your support as well.

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-138) was adopted (with immediate effective date).]

#### Playing and Practice Seasons—Annual Exemptions— Baseball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Soccer and Softball

**Stephen R. Bamford** (Plymouth State College): On behalf of the member institutions within the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 73.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, if adopted, would permit institutions to exempt annually participation in one season-ending tournament from the maximum number of contests or dates of competition in the sports of baseball, softball, soccer, field hockey and lacrosse. Furthermore, this proposal simplifies and makes consistent the annual exemption legislation by providing postseason opportunities in baseball, softball, soccer, field hockey and lacrosse similar to those already offered in the sports of basketball, football and volleyball.

By the way, the Division II membership considered this same piece of legislation and adopted it yesterday. I urge the membership to support the adoption of Proposal No. 73.

[Proposal No. 73 (Page A-174) was adopted.]

#### Contest Limitations—Softball Tournaments—Division III

**Dennis M. Collins** (North Coast Athletic Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, Presidents Commission and Division III Steering Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will establish a definition for the word "tournament" as it applies to contest exemptions in Division III softball. Currently, on two occasions, an institution can count each date of the softball tournament as one contest. However, no definition of "tournament" exists. The Division III Steering Committee believes it is necessary to close this loophole. At last year's Convention, Divisions I and II adopted similar legislation. I urge you to approve this proposal. Thank you.

**Lacy Lee Baker** (National Softball Coaches Association): I'm here to speak against Proposal No. 83. This definition was passed last year for Divisions I and II to further define a tournament; however, for Division III, this definition will prove detrimental because your teams are already limited to 20 less games in the traditional segment than Divisions I and II. The "tournament" definition would primarily affect spring break, in many cases causing competition during this period to be counted as an individual contest rather than as one tournament. Of course, this is a period when academics would not be impacted. It would especially affect Northern teams, which many times are on the field for the first time over spring break. Because of weather limitations, these teams sometimes play one-third of their schedule in that one week. I urge you to vote "no" on Proposal No. 83.



[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-184) was defeated.]

#### **Coaching Limitations and Playing and Practice Seasons— Emerging Sports for Women**

**Linda S. Moulton** (Clark University, Massachusetts): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you recall, we voted at last year's Convention to establish a timetable for applying NCAA rules to emerging women's sports. At that time, it was determined that coaching limitations and playing-and practice-season legislation would apply beginning with the 1996-97 academic year. Proposal 99 represents the culmination of discussions with various national governing bodies, representatives of institutions and conferences that sponsor emerging women's sports, and the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics. I urge you to support this legislation.

[Parts D, E, F, G and H of Proposal No. 99 (Page A-198) were adopted.]

#### **Recruiting—Precollege Expense—Women's Crew**

**Mary Jo Gunning** (Marywood College): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow an institution to loan crew equipment to high-school and junior-club programs' women's teams and would permit an institution to allow those teams to use their crew facilities for both practice and competition. Women's crew is an emerging sport. This proposal will help to encourage the development of women's crew at the junior-club team and high-school level. Ultimately, this should facilitate and encourage the development and participation of more women to become involved in the sport of crew at the collegiate level. Therefore, I urge your support of Proposal No. 123.

[Proposal No. 123 (Page A-242) was adopted.]

**Mr. Coll:** That concludes our voting on legislative matters unless we have some additional business such as a request for reconsideration. Seeing none, the window for reconsideration is concluded. It is concluded and we are now closed for legislative voting.

### **DISCUSSION**

#### **Restructuring**

**Mr. Coll:** It is now time to continue our discussion of Division III restructuring. To lead us through our last discussion, I again would like to ask Dick Rasmussen, executive secretary of the University Athletic Association, and other members of his task force to join us on the dais. I assume we will follow the same format that we had yesterday. We certainly want to encourage participation and questions. Based on the extensive amount of information that has been provided, I'm sure many of you have some questions as well as some suggestions and recommendations that this task force can carry away with it over its deliberations over the next 12 months.

**Richard A. Rasmussen** (University Athletic Association): Before we continue our discussion, I would like to introduce the members of our panel. We have with us this morning Dennis Collins, executive di-

rector of the North Coast Conference; Rocky Carzo, director of athletics at Tufts University; Bridget Belgiovine, director of athletics at the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse; Linda Moulton, director of athletics at Clark University, Massachusetts; and Jeff Ankrom, faculty member at Wittenberg University.

As we begin the discussion this morning, I would just like to touch base on a couple of the premises that we began with yesterday. The issues we're speaking about this morning deal with championship issues. We're looking at these issues as a result of concerns that have been expressed by the membership over the last few years, particularly with regard to access to championships, the competitive equity that exists within our championship structure, the impact of increased membership on that structure and the possibility for continued future growth in our membership and its impact on our championship structure. I would also like to remind people that we talked about looking at these issues in the context of our Division III philosophy statement. Some of the principles embodied in the statement include broad-based participation, opportunity for men and women, maximizing participation opportunities, treating student-athletes like other students and an emphasis on in-season, regional and conference competition. With that said, we will get into the two areas that we are hoping to discuss this morning with regard to championships. In looking at the championship issue as it relates to some of these concerns, we're suggesting that there may be two approaches to addressing these concerns.

The first of these would be to structure our championships so that we could conduct simultaneously a parallel set of regional and national championships. The second approach is to come up with some means of subdividing the division in those championships where we have the higher levels of sports sponsorship. As our task force looked at this issue and the concerns that have been expressed, it appeared to us that the concerns we are addressing are primarily in team championships with the higher levels of institutional sponsorship. In particular, we're suggesting that we look at either of these two options. We should consider applying these options across those 18 sports in which we have sponsorship levels. To do it with other championship fields would probably be very difficult because the size of the fields would become very small and we would have a lot of difficulty across a number of our regions. So what we're talking about would apply to the sports of baseball, men's basketball, women's basketball, football, men's soccer, women's soccer, softball and volleyball. The other team and individual sports would not be affected by this. Even if we chose to follow the option of subdividing, we would remain as a unified division with unified championships in those other team sports and in the individual sports. We would also remain in a unified division for governance and legislative purposes. A part of our rationale for not looking at the individual sports is based on the recommendations that came forward to the championships committee and the task force from the sports committees as we looked at championships during the past year. There seemed to be a pretty good level of satisfaction with the size of the fields of those sports and the concerns that we've heard expressed over the last years, which tend to focus primarily on team sports.



First of all, the first topic we'll discuss is the concept of regional and national championships. We're suggesting that the national championship fields would remain unaffected by this proposal. The field size of the national championships would remain the same. The national sport-by-sport championships would remain the same. We're not talking about changing anything in the national championships. What we would do is create a set of regional championships in each district. We suggest that the quality and organization of those regional championships need to be on the same level as our national championships. We also suggest that the field size of these regional championships be something comparable to what it is in the national championships. It may not be quite possible in some cases. For instance, in basketball, the regional championship may not be quite as large as the national field is, but in most of the sports, it would probably be the same size or very close to the same size. The competition in the regional championships would be completed in one weekend. So in most instances within a region, we would be talking about a situation where we would have four teams or so selected to a single-elimination competition, and that could be accomplished in one weekend or one week. It would provide those student-athletes with an opportunity of something to shoot for during the course of the year that they might not otherwise be offered, but yet it would be an opportunity that would be over and completed within one week so that they could get back to concentrating on their studies or get involved in other sports or activities on campus.

If we choose to go this route, there are two ways in which we could organize the selection into the regional championships. There may be others, but these were two that our group came up with. One is, the championship pools could be organized as mutually exclusive pools. At the start of the year, an institution would specify sport-by-sport which pool they would like to be "self-selected" into. In men's soccer, we're going to compete in a regional championship pool. In women's soccer, you may compete in the national championship pool. In basketball, you may choose a level for your program so that you would compete at the regional level and so on. You could make that determination sport-by-sport. During the selection process, we would have two completely separate pools to choose from. The process of being placed in a pool would be determined by each institution. This does a couple of things. It does imply that we would not have an automatic bid option available to us because the institutions are "self-selecting." Institutions within a conference could select it to one championship or the other. So if we did choose this type of option, it would not be possible to offer automatic bids for conferences.

Our other option for organizing regional play would be to use the "tiered" selection process. In that selection process, we would simply look at their rankings within their regions as a selection committee. If you have four teams selected to the national pool in soccer, for instance, you take the top four teams in the region. They would be selected into the national championship. They would go into the first round in their region and on to the next national championship. The other teams would be selected into the regional pool. That offers a different approach. There isn't a "self-selection" to one or the other. There

are arguments that that may be a good thing or it may not be a good thing. In some regards, it's probably a little more of a streamlined process in terms of selection, but there may be other advantages that people see with the mutually exclusive pool. If you did use a "tiered" system, we would be able to continue the use of automatic bids for the championship structure.

As far as the cost issues, the funding for the national championships would remain unaffected. They would be fully funded. We've been working with the recommendations that have been put forward by the task force as a basis for what funding we might have available. We would assume that in moving forward with this that we would look at fully funding regional championships as well. That would be our goal. As we make some preliminary estimates, we feel as if we're in the ball park. We feel that given the funding that's available as a result of restructuring, it looks as though you've got the resources to move in this direction. We may not be able to get to it right away. It may take us a period of a few years to get to the point where the revenue is such that we could provide this type of opportunity, but it is a realistic option. The one thing I should note is that we haven't looked at the implications of the administrative overhead cost of the national office and what effect it's going to have on that championship staff. We haven't looked at the financial implications or a process for selecting committees per se, but those are things that we will be looking at and developing more detail for if the response we get from you this morning and over the next few months indicates that there's some genuine interest in following this paradigm.

I should mention once again that quality will be a big issue. We want that experience to be the same quality experience for those student-athletes as it is for student-athletes going into the current national championships.

Another concern that you have to work through at the next level of detail is going to be sure that if we do go to this, that we have an adequate pool of institutions to draw from in both regional and national pools. We hope that we would not get to a situation where we had a regional and national pool and find that in a given region nobody wants to be in the regional pool. That's something I'm sure we could deal with and something that would probably even itself out over a period of time. So that's the regional and national model.

The other approach that we could look at is subdividing our division for championships. We would be looking at trying to come up with two comparably sized groups of institutions for postseason competition. We would hope in doing this we would increase the access to postseason competition. We would hope that they would create a greater similarity of institutions within each pool and thereby would provide a greater level of competitive equity within championship pools. In taking a look at ways to accomplish such a subdivision, we look at a number of different options, which you have before you this morning. We looked at a lot of criteria. We looked at suggestions that were offered to us last year during a similar forum and also at the NACDA Convention. Others were submitted by the membership during the course of the last 12 months. It seemed to us that there were three criteria on which we



could make a rational case for subdividing.

Those criteria would be to subdivide for championships on the basis of sports-sponsorship level. That gives an indication of the program's orientation, commitment to certain areas of the philosophy statement, resources and so on. Another rationale could be to use full-time undergraduate enrollment, which offers a suggestion of the institution's ability to draw on resources, recruiting core and so on. There's a logical rationale there. The other possibility would be to look at an index combination of those two. Last year, we looked at the index that Jeff Ankrom developed, which is a combination of sports sponsorship and enrollment that groups schools according to student enrollment and sports sponsorship. Larger schools with lower sports sponsorship tend to go to the other end of the scale and then you have the spread in between.

We did look at other options. If you look at the pink sheet on the top of the handout, you see the distributions we came up with when we looked at what the numbers look like if we used this or used that, and we looked at other things like total sports sponsorship or student-to-sport ratios. But we found those numbers tend to replicate the results of others. So at least to begin with, we would like to focus on the sports-sponsorship level, enrollment and the Ankrom index. What we tried to put before you today is if we choose this option, this is an example of how it might play out. This is not where you are going to end up and that's it, end of discussion.

As I mentioned yesterday, there's some difficulty with the information. Some people are sponsoring more sports now than when the information was collected. But we're hoping to find how this plays out. What kinds of issues and problems are we going to have to deal with? We ran models for each of these three options. We ran them using levels around what I would call the inflection point. We looked at where the point is when we go to the next level and the size of the two subdivisions switch. For example, for sports sponsorship level, if you choose a threshold level of seven men's and seven women's sports, the "A" subdivision is the larger division. If you go to eight men's and eight women's sports, it flip-flops and "AA" division becomes a larger division. So we would probably want to use one of those two as a threshold. Similarly, we did that for undergraduate enrollment. The threshold there appears to be 1,400 and 1,500 students. The Ankrom index appears to be an index of 100 or 105. As I've said, we can look at other models. We can move in different directions, but what you have before you if we choose these thresholds is the kind of spread you are going to get. This is the kind of alignment we're going to get.

I do need to point out a couple of things about assumptions we used. The one primary assumption we used in generating these listings is that conferences would remain intact. We're assuming that all members of the conference would be placed in the same subdivision for championship purposes, which means that if the majority of institutions in the conference would qualify for one subdivision, all the institutions would be placed in there. So in sports sponsorship, if you had nine schools and three schools had sports sponsorships of less than eight and six had sports sponsorship levels of eight or more, you would

end up in a subdivision requiring sponsoring eight men's and women's sports. That introduces a great deal of diversity into this model. Much of the diversity that we have in the current championship structure will carry-over into all of these models because within our conferences we have a fair level of diversity with regard to size, sports sponsorship and other issues. So that's not going to go away entirely using the subdividing option.

In looking at the cost implications for this type of model, we've done some very preliminary estimates. We do know a couple of things. We know that we cannot afford to do this and subdivide using the same field size that we currently have for both subdivisions. If you have a soccer field size of 32 teams now, we know that we cannot afford to go to 32 teams in each subdivision. We know that we can't afford to double our championship cost. By the same token, we looked at splitting the fields in half and going from a national field of 32 to two national fields of 16 and 16. We know that's way within our ability to fund the championships. So the field sizes we would be looking at are likely to be somewhere in between there. They've probably something on the order of two-thirds to three-quarters of the field size that we're using right now, or it would probably vary sport by sport, depending on what makes sense for that sport. It is difficult to do a field size of 12 in football. That makes it tough. It introduces a notion of bias and so on. This also may introduce a need to realign regions. Instead of using eight regions, we may have to go to a different number of regions to do that sort of thing. But those are options that we would consider down the road, depending on the interest.

We haven't looked at the implications for administrative staffing in the national office yet. We know there will be additional demands. This type of approach would require a replication of selection committees. Sport-by-sport, we would more than likely have to have a separate selection committee for one subdivision and one for the other subdivision. Either that, or we would double the work in the selection committee within a region and not introduce some other considerations. We would also suggest that if we look at subdivision as a means of structuring our championships, that we also introduce a petition process whereby independent institutions or conferences could present a rationale for inclusion in the other subdivision. There may be reasons why institutions would fit better in one subdivision or another.

A number of you mentioned last night as you looked at this that your enrollment numbers are way off. Your enrollment may be 6,000 students, but when you look at these considerations, the number of real undergraduate students you can draw from is different. Our enrollment numbers look very different. There are a lot of difficulties working with numbers like this. There's going to need to be some kind of mechanism to look at those kind of rationales on a case-by-case basis. We would suggest that that should be part of this.

I think as far as our models go, we've got the two options—the regional national parallel structure and subdivision. We would like to ask the other panelists to offer any comments that they might have and we'll open it up for questions. When we complete our discussion, we're going to provide each of you with a questionnaire. That question-



naire will cover the topics that we've spoken about—the membership issues that we spoke about yesterday and both of these concepts. We have about five or six questions on each of these. We would like to get your reaction as to whether you think these options are desirable, undesirable and so on. We ask you to complete that questionnaire before you leave this session so that we have some guidance that we can use to move forward. We'll probably follow-up with collecting similar information on an institutional basis so that you have a chance to look at this with your CEOs later on. Part of that information-gathering will be directed by the results that we get today. There may be other types of information that we want to draw out based on the open-ended comments that you provide as well as the reaction to these things. So with that, I would ask the other panelists if there are things that we want to fill in. Dennis.

**Dennis M. Collins** (North Coast Athletic Conference): Thank you, Dick. Yesterday after our discussion, we had some excellent questions from the membership in the lobby. I have a couple of those questions. I thought I would bring them up today and talk about them. Maybe we can all talk and share them. As Dick presented the models yesterday, the question arose: "What is a broad-based program?" That's a very basic question, but I thought it was an excellent question.

I think we're probably at the point now in this division with changing forces. As our division has been changing and growing, as we have the prospect of changing even more, I think the time to answer that question is now. I can get you started on that path by having a look at the information that Dick has provided. For example, we know by the demographics that over half of our division—well over half of our division—sponsors seven men's and seven women's sports for a total of 14. So that certainly is a starting point as possibly defining what is a broad-based program.

Another good question came up in the lobby: "Isn't it true that a school with an enrollment of 1,000 students that sponsors 15 sports is making a commitment to a broad-based program? That's probably far different than a school of 5,000 sponsoring the same amount of sports as far as commitment and resources and so forth. Just a starting point. I thought it was an interesting point that was mentioned. So that may help kickoff our discussion conceptually. I'll go back to the first question, though. With all of these models, we're in essence after 23 years finally defining what a broad-based program in Division III is.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** Thank you, Dennis. Do any of the other panelists want to offer any comments before we open it up to questions? We would like to entertain any questions or comments you have.

**Timothy W. Gleason** (Ohio Athletic Conference): What was the committee's position on the merits of subdividing, as you have on the sheets, but to stay within the financial parameters to have all of those championships with first-round play-ins where the institution would sponsor the first round? It also would probably fit within the national financial budget as far as the schools are concerned. Usually, those games are relatively close geographically so that it wouldn't present that much of a cost to them. What is the committee's position on that?

**Mr. Rasmussen:** If I understand your question correctly, you are talking about the first-round games being institutionally funded?

**Mr. Gleason:** If you subdivide by keeping the same-size fields, you can then have the institutions pay for the first-round games and perhaps even use ticket sales to offset the cost of a bus, a meal and whatever.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** That's one thing we did not really consider. I don't think we have a position on that per se. We talked about it in terms of funding. I think our preference would be to keep the championships fully funded. That would be our ideal option, but that's certainly something that could be considered because that introduces a lot more flexibility in where we go with subdividing the size of the championship fields. But it does introduce costs. In some regions, those costs could be significant because of the travel involved, but that's something I think we should probably look at.

**Bridget Belgiovine** (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): The committee does not have a position on that. But if you recall Judy Sweet's presentation and President Weller's presentation about the history of where Division III has come, we didn't talk about it because we've come to the point where the Association is paying for championships. That particular question would be an issue that our committee would really like to hear about from the membership. That would be very significant for us to go back to paying for all of those first rounds, so we would like to hear your comments about that one.

**Don Tecklenburg** (Wilmington College, Ohio): Did you look at what championships would break out by sport based on these differences? I worry a little bit in dealing with the aggregate that you may end up with a situation where there would be an additional number of football-playing schools in one than the other and by sport.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** No, we haven't. That's the next level that we have to look at. Right now, we're dealing with a fair amount of detail and looking at it on a conceptual basis and what we're going to look like overall. Before we go too far with this, you are exactly right. It does need to be played out sport-by-sport within the region because there may be some subdivided regions that don't shake out. If we look at the profile from each division and the distribution of institutions within regions, it appears that it's probably reasonable to think that we would be all right in the larger sports but, for example, football may be a problem. That's the next level that has to be looked at.

**Mr. Tecklenburg:** Having a different designation for each sport is another option.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** It's quite possible that when we go down this route we can't subdivide a particular sport.

**James E. Nelson** (Suffolk University): This conversation today seems somewhat incongruous to yesterday's conversation in terms of how we're thinking of looking at situations sport-by-sport. Yesterday, we were talking relative to ratios. Speaking just on behalf of men's and women's basketball, it seems like we would be certainly replicating some of the championships we already have in the East. The ECAC, in addition to the NCAA, sponsors an 18-team championship held over a week's period. We're talking about a significant number of



teams that would be involved in both the NCAA and the ECAC championships. There's never been a time that Rocky Carzo has not been informative and entertaining. I'm wondering whether he might have some comments on this.

**Rocco J. Carzo** (Tufts University): I don't know who the last speaker was. But did he use my name in vein? I want to tell you a story. On the way over here yesterday, I found this coin....Thanks, Jim.

I think we have to explore all the questions that you and everyone else is raising. It's extremely important for us to recognize that this time everything is okay. What we're trying to figure out is if we get any bigger than we are, how are we going to do it? Do we take care of the people who are here now and exclude the people who come in new? Or do we open it up and say we're going to have a bigger Division III so we have to figure out both possibilities? That's exactly what we're trying to do. It becomes crystal clear when we open Division III membership up and it expands beyond another 40 or 50 schools that we've reached the elastic limit. Something has to be done. When we look at that possibility, one of the options that comes out of that scenario is that if we have 600 schools in Division III, that we now have to have either regional championships exclusively, national championships or a combination of the two. If we did have national championships, there would never be enough dates and we would never stick to our basic ratios for team championships that we've established.

There are a lot of variables that need to be worked in. We need to get this kind of feedback, but we shouldn't be threatened by the fact that we are going to go back to Division III regional championships or we're going to have only national championships or we may have a combination. We don't know that yet until you tell us. But when we decide, we're eventually going to say we have to be reasonable about what we expect in terms of championship participation that will still fit into the whole academic calendar. That is what our problem is. I've managed to take 10 minutes to avoid answering your question. Thank you very much, Jim.

**Dennis A. Booher** (University of Pittsburgh at Bradford): With the simultaneous suggestion, would we run into some more gender-equity issues? For example, if a particular university takes five teams to a national and three to a regional—whether they are male or female—wouldn't that create some other problems for us and some concerns about gender-equity issues?

**Mr. Rasmussen**: I would suggest that it might. It might create another issue for you, but it also may create an opportunity for you if you are trying to do more with your women's program and you know you are not in a position to compete nationally. It's like coming up with a strategy to comply with Title IX. You are providing more opportunity. For a few years, you could go into the women's championship and experience it at that level and have a little better opportunity to recruit. Once the kids are feeling more positive, you move up a level. It introduces an issue, but I think it's probably one that could cut both ways. But you are right. It's another thing to consider.

**Linda S. Moulton** (Clark University, Massachusetts): I could see where that might be more of an issue if you have to declare either

going to the national championship or the regional route. But I think if we would move to a system where the top "X" number of teams go to the national championship bracket versus "X" number of teams that are regional, I think that puts everybody in the position of being treated the same. I think throughout this process we'd certainly consider gender equity and be very sensitive to that. But I do caution us not to think that that certainly has to be the driving force behind all of this. It certainly is in some of our decisions about the way to go, if we go any direction. We may go full circle and come back to where we are now. We may in the end say maybe what we have isn't so bad. But we feel that we need to take you through a process where we are carefully looking at everything, given the changes that are taking place within the Association. I think the other statement that may not necessarily be tied into the question—even though we are discussing championships—is that there are a lot of other things that we need to keep coming back to in terms of what do we stand for as a division. To me, broad-based participation opportunities don't necessarily mean that a national championship is the only answer. In many ways, regional championships, as Dick said, really expand the opportunities for men and women. I think that's what we need to keep in mind, that we are looking for ways within our own constraints to try to provide as many opportunities as we can. For some of us, national championships isn't necessarily the end-all.

**Harlan Knosher** (Knox College): First, I think it should be said by someone that the committee has done a good piece of work. It really clarifies a lot of things for all of us. (Applause)

From the perspective of an institution that has aspired since the beginning of Division III for national competition in team sports and succeeded very seldom, instead of just saying to our teams every year, "listen we're shooting for nationals," I would favor two sets of national championships. There's something to be said for going for the national level, whether it's as a Division III-A or Division III-AA.

I also think the idea of staying as a single body legislatively and just doing this on a competitive basis in terms of national and regional championships is a wonderful idea.

Finally, it seems to me that the thing that really could be great about this would be to continue following up on the idea of sport-to-sport to see if there's any way to make this the best it can possibly be in every single individual sport situation. I realize that seems unrealistic, but that really rang a bell with me.

Again, referring to the idea of getting into national competition in team sports, we're one institution very quick to say that we would be happy to pay for a first-round game to keep those field sizes up and to make it possible for as many teams as possible to get into. Thanks.

**Carlyle Carter** (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I want to echo the last speaker and thank the committee for the work that they have done. It's obviously a monumental task to get all the data put together.

I do have a question regarding the route behind the subdivision. It creates greater access to national championships, which is really counter to our philosophy in Division III. I think if we're to be true to



ourselves, we have to admit that there is differing philosophies within this room. There are some of us who believe that maybe national championships aren't the answer to everything. There is a different philosophy that normal progress should be normal progress toward a degree and not normal progress toward athletics eligibility. I think it's important that we keep that in mind. If there is going to be a subdivision and we do fear an influx of members from the NAIA, perhaps we need to consider that we do have different philosophies within this room and that maybe the subdivision based on academic standards would be a way to go.

**Kitty R. Baird** (Centre College): Did you consider four enhanced regional championships with only the one winner from each region going on to nationals?

**Mr. Rasmussen:** No, we didn't. You might want to explain that a little bit more.

**Ms. Baird:** I think being a regional champion or having a chance of a regional championship is really great. I think we've sort of lost that in our championships recently by crossing over districts or regions. We could have one team from each region go on to postseason in one weekend championship and have the national that way.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** How would that differ from the current national championship?

**Ms. Baird:** It would differ because we don't give much credence to the regional championships. We are crossing over within the regions before we get to the nationals. This way, you would just have four teams competing for the national championship. Everyone else would be competing to be the regional champion or to be a part of the second-place team in the region. Now, you go one weekend. Then you go the next weekend. You are crossing with another district so you really don't know who your regional champions are.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** Are you suggesting that we just go with four regions nationally?

**Ms. Baird:** Yes.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** So you have a larger regional championship, but only four districts nationally and then those four feeding immediately into the national championship?

**Ms. Baird:** Right.

**Linda E. Hople** (Middle Atlantic States Conference): One of the keys to the regional idea was a one-weekend-only event. The second key was that you could probably physically take care of regional championships as well as the national championship issue.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** Correct.

**Chuck Gordon** (Emory University): Since I always take what Rocco says as fact, I usually agree. Let's assume we're all reasonably satisfied with what we have right now. Most of our universities and colleges are parts of consortiums or other associations that have a limited membership, including the greater majority of the people in this room—athletics conferences. Many of these assumptions we're basing these discussions on include grossly inflated numbers because we welcome everyone who wants to join us. Why don't we consider extending the moratorium on membership? Why do we have to have an unlimited

supply of potential people to join us in Division III? I understand we may have some restraint-of-trade issues. There are some other things that need to be looked at from the legal side, but must we be a group that if 800 institutions and every trade school in the United States or everyone who decides they want to have a group that wants to join us need to be welcomed? I don't want to take all the Division II members who decide it's cheaper. I don't know why we have to have an open door forever for everyone who wants to join us. Maybe the NCAA staff needs to be directed to look at what extending a moratorium for 10 years means. If we do it for three, why can't we consider it for 10?

**Donald Harnum** (Susquehanna University): I would echo the thoughts of the previous speaker in that you certainly ought to extend the moratorium until we get this all figured out to the satisfaction of the Division III membership. I think we all need to be reminded that what caused a lot of contortion and politics at the Division I level is the quest for a national championship and trying to put everybody on a level playing field or a level court. We're going through this exercise right now. What is driving Division III in this discussion? How do we determine the national champion? This could pull us apart. I think we really need to think that issue through very carefully. Do we want to make a statement about what Division III is all about by fighting over how we determine national champions and pull our membership apart based on our philosophy?

If we are all about broad-based participation and the student-athlete on our own campuses, maybe one idea we ought to consider is keeping our national championships about the same as they are and take the money that is left over as a surplus. Let's say it's \$800,000. Let's take half of that and distribute \$400,000 to each individual member of Division III on this Ankrom index. So for a "broader-based" program, maybe I get 1,500 or 2,000 bucks a year. If I have a "lower" broad-based program, I get less money. I know there's lots of colleges in this division that can use a little money for programs on their own campuses or for their own student-athletes. Some schools are really hurting right now and could use a few thousand bucks on their campuses. So maybe that's an idea to consider.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** With regard to the moratorium, I'm going to ask Dan Dutcher to respond to that.

**Daniel T. Dutcher** (NCAA): Just a quick comment on the legal aspects of extending the moratorium. I'm certainly not an expert in antitrust law, but the experts who we have consulted with advise us that any kind of closed-door policy would be on very, very shaky legal ground. The membership moratorium that we have implemented we felt was sound because of the rationale that was based upon the time needed to solve the very serious and very significant restructuring issues before us. So, to the extent that the moratorium is linked to the consideration and resolution of restructuring, we feel we're on sound legal ground. To extend it beyond the resolution of the restructuring issue, our advisers tell us we're treading into much more troubled waters.

**Philip A. Rowe** (Daniel Webster College): We're a small, 500-student institution that specializes in flying airplanes. I don't know if



we're doing much flying today out on the East Coast, but that's what we do. So we're very nervous about the direction of the split that we appear to have in Division III and in our conference as well. I suggest that we take a look at the possibility of expanding NCAA Division III championships, and I bring it to you this way. I was a soccer coach at a great institution, but we were in the final four three times in Division III. Those student-athletes had a tremendous experience going to the final four and the tiers that allowed us to participate against other institutions. It can happen for more people if we look at the possibility of regionalizing the tournaments. I suggest we look at it academically as well. We don't want to miss class time. If we had 16 representatives from each region in our postseason play meeting, they can break that down in one weekend to eight, then to four, then you have a final four on the next weekend. They all get together and you have eight people meeting at the national championship. So you have included more people around the country in your championships. You have cut down on class time missed and it makes it more worthwhile for all of our student-athletes. This is a proposal that our conference is definitely going to push forward and talk to other conferences about. I think that the task force will feel it will be helpful to all of us.

**Seth C. Johnson** (Principia College): I think it's important that when we consider the national championships, that we're sure that the teams are national-caliber teams. I would not want my kids feeling that they are playing a national championship when they are not really a national-championship-caliber team. I think as coaches and athletics directors we know in many respects what that means. We don't want to water it down so our kids actually feel they are playing in national championships when a team is not up to that caliber.

**Dennis M. Collins** (North Coast Athletic Conference): That's a good comment. I want to respond to it in a way that I think may be helpful. I think as we are evaluating whether subdividing would be a good thing or would cheapen the value of a national championship, you have to look to our Association first. For example, in Division I-AA, we have a football championship. These 110 or 112 football-playing institutions take a great deal of pride in playing in that division and winning a national championship. That didn't exist until 1978, but quickly gained stature. Most of these subdivision models amongst our 400 members divide the division in half. Being a national champion of over 200 members, I would think would quickly become a very significant accomplishment. Our friends in Division II yesterday and today are also talking about subdividing into four regions for football and maybe other sports. So this concept, while new to us, has history, has credibility. I think it just takes getting used to as we look at the possibilities because we have to understand things are changing. It's not the same. We are growing. So we probably need to warm up to the concept of a national championship with subdivision.

**Leon Londer** (Carleton College): I would like to comment about cheapening the national championships. Coming from a state where they have multiple championships at the high-school levels, which are based upon institutional size even though they allow schools to choose to go up to a larger-size level, the multiple championships have not

cheapened the state championship or the enjoyment that the individual students have in participating in those championships. Say we did split into two divisions hypothetically for access to national championships. If your institution felt that the Division III-A was the division to be in, it could select that division. I think that you can get into a lot of reasons to split institutions up. You can go college, you can go academic, you can go into size of the institution. But if you notice, you end up with a bell curve. There are a few up here and a few here and there is a whole bunch right here. That's what happens when you do statistical analysis. That's the way the world is. You have the bell curve. You have to decide where you make those splits. I think an easy one is institutional size. You could self-select up if that opportunity presented itself. If we add 800 members, maybe you go to three size divisions. I think those are the things that give people access to national championship situations. The bigger issue in team championship issues is the opportunity to play in them and to avoid the political realm that was addressed by the gentleman from Knox College. We have had teams with undefeated seasons in team sports, but a group of people have decided that their undefeated season and that what their athletes earned isn't as good as an undefeated season from another area or a win/loss record from another area. I think those situations are extremely unfortunate. The political part of selection to these team championships is of grave concern as well. I think there's some way to subdivide by size and allow a system for playing into these national championships. However, I advocate that if you don't win your conference, you had better not be going on to a national championship. I don't care how tough you think your football conference is. You should have to earn a right to go on. I think that these comments about watering it down or it's not a good enough championship is a bunch of baloney. These high-school kids are having a great time. They love it, the schools love it, their kids love it. It's a great opportunity.

**Philip Godfrey** (Washington University, Missouri): In response to Chuck's question with regard to a moratorium, I think we might be able to attempt to achieve the same goal in other ways. I'm wondering if there might be some value in considering making the membership requirements a little stiffer for new members, not necessarily on sports-sponsorship issues. If we increase sports-sponsorship requirements, I think eventually it will impact those championships down the road. But maybe we can do something like increase the dues for new members. If the value of our division is so great, if it's increasing, then why can't the fees increase in proportion to the value of the division? There might be other ways to cut down on the potential numbers rather than having a complete moratorium on membership. I think we ought to think about those possibilities.

**Jennepher P. Shillingford** (Bryn Mawr College): I want to respond to Don's comment about giving money back to the institutions. That makes me extraordinarily nervous. I think that's a Division I concept. I hope that we will have the vision to develop an endowment and use a percentage of it as we do in schools—five, six percent, no more than that. If you want to give back to the colleges, establish a grant program and establish categories in which people can compete



for funding that will help in various programs. I would hate to see us get into the "let's give back" game. This is the same group last year who made the comment that we shouldn't sell out. We'll be able to handle our own championships if we have to. I just want to remind you of that. Thank you.

**Mike McCready** (Upper Iowa University): I would like to congratulate the committee. I think they showed great wisdom in separating the 18 sports that 200 or more schools sponsor. I think that that's a completely different situation than the individual sports. I don't see any reason why we wouldn't want to subdivide any of the individual championships. The team championships create unique problems in terms of size of school and some of the other areas. In Iowa, we sit right next to the Wisconsin and our football and our basketball coaches and our baseball coaches don't seem to want to play them very much. But in individual sports, we compete with them on a regular basis and there doesn't seem to be any difficulty. I think the committee showed real wisdom in the proposal. I would support developing the concept of allowing more student-athletes into the national championships, and maintaining the individual championship.

**Robert R. Peck** (Williams College): I'm a little concerned about what I perceive to be the tremendous overemphasis on national championships. Have we considered what would happen if 250 NAIA schools came into our division? Are we afraid that we could not be competitive? I'm concerned about that sort of lack of confidence. I guess my main concern is will they abide by the financial aid rules? Will they abide by the general rules of the Association? I would like us to consider whether we could be competitive with a couple of more hundred institutions if they were abiding by the same rules we are. If we can be competitive in national championships, then we can be competitive in regional championships. I'm concerned about the overemphasis of the national championships.

**Mary Jo Gunning** (Marywood College): I rise as a member of the Division III restructuring task force. Although my comments are not specific to championships, I believe that they are important in terms of what we've been through for the last day-and-a-half. Yesterday and this morning were very positive steps for Division III, particularly in terms of restructuring. I believe the foundation for that success is due to the work that the committee has accomplished, but more importantly, because of the dialogue and your input. Regardless of the differences of opinions, regardless of different scions we all may take, I heard something that concerns me a little bit. Some of our colleagues have a feeling that restructuring is beyond their control, that issues are being decided by a very unreachable or unattainable day. Those individuals on the task force are representatives of us. Therefore, these decisions are your decisions and they are our decisions. As a result, I would just like to encourage everyone as we come toward the end of our discussion to take the time—I know Dick will talk about it in a little bit—to fill out and complete this feedback form. Also, during the next 12 to 18 months, take the time to relay your opinions to the members of the task force, which is very much in tune with the philosophy of Division III. No one decision is made by one group. The decision is

up to us and it represents those student-athletes that we're all about. Thanks.

**Linda S. Moulton** (Clark University, Massachusetts): Just a couple of last comments. One, I think responds to what Bob Peck says. I do caution us and I think that the task force has been very sensitive to the fact that this is not just a numbers issue. It's not just that we need to be concerned about the influx of additional members into Division III. We've had issues within our own membership dealing with championships and membership criteria for a long time. This is not a new discussion for us. This has been around long before the whole issue of restructuring came about. So I just caution us not to use the fact that there may be a lot of new members coming into our division to be the reason that we are reacting, but to address our current disparities with our own membership so that we can resolve those and at the same time figure out how additional membership may fit into that.

Secondly, I think you should know that Dick, in fact, has been the driving force behind the information. While it's nice that we all take credit, he really deserves 99.5 percent of the credit for the information that's been generated. (Applause)

**Mr. Rasmussen:** Thank you, Linda.

**Walter J. Johnson** (North Central College): I know there are a number of issues that we've been talking about relative to access to national championships. I have to admit that I have never been and I don't see myself becoming a proponent of subdividing. With that in mind as we discuss these issues, I would also like the committee and the body to consider this from a different perspective. If subdividing was not a possibility how would we handle the same problems and the same concerns? I would like the committee to also look at this from that perspective. If that's not an option for us, if you throw that out, how would you answer the same questions? I have to admit I don't have an answer, but I would like us to also address these issues from that perspective.

**Lawrence R. Schiner** (Jersey City State College): I'm a member of the Division III restructuring task force. I would like to respond briefly to some of the feedback received during yesterday's discussion regarding future sports-sponsorship requirements. The task force is aware of the unique circumstances that confront some of the present membership in their ability to increase the number of sports that they are able to sponsor. I want to assure these institutions, especially those located in the urban areas, that the task force is sensitive to their concerns and will discuss those ideas thoroughly before making any future recommendations to the Presidents Commission.

**Rick Simon** (University of La Verne): Since we're being asked to give some feedback on the possibility of the mutually exclusive national and regional playoffs, I can see some of the disadvantages of that potential, but I would appreciate some explanation of the advantages of that set-up.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** Let me take a stab at that. If any of the other people up here would like to add something, I'm sure they will. Some of the advantages that I think come out of that is that within our programs we have teams where over the course of time they can compete



and become successful.

**Mr. Simon:** I'm sorry, Dick. I don't think I phrased that completely. I wanted to hear the rationale for making teams prechoose which pool they were going to compete in.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** One of the concerns that we get back from various institutions is that they feel like within their region or across the country that there are a group of perennially strong schools that go into the national championships. There may be a group of five, six, seven, eight schools within a region that we just can't compete against year in, year out. For various reasons, their programs are a lot stronger than ours and so on. If we use a tiered system, we're going to get the same thing that's blocking our student-athletes from a postseason experience. If we take the top four in the national championship, then the next four into the regional championship, it's still the same institutions, so we're really not changing the mix of people who have access to a postseason opportunity.

By providing two exclusive pools into which schools "self-select," the assumption might be that those institutions would continue to be in the national pool, whereas the regional pool might very well open up another avenue to institutions that can't get over that hump. They would be competing with another group of institutions that for various reasons aren't going to be able to compete at the national level. This would provide across the country, if we have eight regions, another eight institutions that experience some sort of success. They finish their season being in the finals of a championship and so on. So, I think it developed out of that rationale. The assumption may not be correct, but from my perspective, I think that's part of where it comes from.

**Dick Kaiser** (Olivet College): I just want to take this opportunity to remind some of the people in this room where they came from. There are many people sitting in this room who once upon a time worked or had administrative decisions in the NAIA. Believe it or not, that particular organization has spent the last five to six years discussing the exact same thing we are discussing today. In fact, they have solved many of the problems and have gone to divisions of competition, regional play and on to national play. I suggest, as we have talked about many times today, extending the moratorium and being careful who we allow in. They have already invented the wheel and we need not look much further than maybe some of the individuals who are sitting in the room waiting for an opportunity to become members of the NCAA.

**Mr. Rasmussen:** Thank you. I think at this point we can probably move on to the next phase of what we would like to do. We've passed out a feedback questionnaire to everyone. We would like you to complete that questionnaire before you leave the room today. We fully realize that some of these issues are issues that you would like to consult with people back on your campuses and so on. We do intend to provide that type of opportunity in the coming months, but it would be helpful to get some initial reaction to discussions while it's still fresh in your minds and to direct us in the coming months and perhaps identify other questions that we need to ask when we come back and survey

you on an institutional basis. I suggest that we go through the questionnaire and answer the questions. If you have questions about specific parts of it that you don't understand, we would be glad to try to clear those up right now. I know that the terms "desirable" and "undesirable" don't fit every question exactly, but we're looking for a range of positive to negative reactions.

I offer three other points to help us on things that we didn't think of as we drafted the questionnaire. It might be helpful if we had a sense of regionally where things were coming from, particularly the question we're asking about sports that are sponsored and whether you might be interested in regional and national play. This gets to the issue about subdividing sport-by-sport. But if in the upper left-hand corner of the first page you just would list which state your institution is located in and then in the upper right-hand corner if you would indicate your title, that may provide us with some guidance too. We don't know how useful the information we'll get back will be or where it will take us, but those are things that probably wouldn't hurt.

The other thing I would ask you to do is at the end of the questionnaire with the open-ended section or anywhere that you want, please offer your comments. If there is something that strikes you after this question, please let us know that. When we follow-up and try to survey the institutions, we'll take a look if there are issues and questions raised consistently. We would be sure to include those kinds of questions when we move forward with assessing this even more. With that, are there any other comments that we have? Are there any other questions?

**(Unidentified Delegate):** In this column, it says team sports sponsored by your institution, but it's opposite baseball and then it's confusing. It says team sports sponsored by the institution. Isn't that the same number all the way down that column?

**Mr. Rasmussen:** Yes. We would like you to go sport-by-sport. For example, if you sponsor baseball, check the first box. If you think that your baseball program is one that would have fit into the national pool, if we had this option, would you "self-select" into the national or regional pool? Again, we're not looking for a definitive thing now and forever. We're just trying to get a sense if this happened today, would we have a problem with the distribution of institutions? Any other questions about that? We'll leave a couple of boxes on the back table as we're going out. If you would put the questionnaires on the table as you leave, that's where we would like to get them. Thank you very much. (Applause)

**Mr. Coll:** Thank you, Dick, and thank all of you for your comments. I am particularly grateful for your willingness to take time to fill out these questionnaires. I know the task force will certainly find them to be very helpful. I would also like to thank Dick for his hard work in compiling the information that you have received during these discussion sessions. You may think that all of this information was on file at the national office, that we simply asked the staff to run copies of these materials and distribute them to you. Well, that is simply not the case. Dick has compiled almost all of this information himself over the past year, and clearly that represents a great deal of work on his



part for which we all should be extremely grateful. I hate to think where we would be not only as a task force but also as a division if we did not have this information to get us through the next 18 months. So please join me in expressing my appreciation to Dick and the rest of the task force. (Applause)

#### NOMINATING COMMITTEE

**Mr. Coll:** We will now elect our new Council members and division vice-president.

*[Note: The slate for Division III representatives to the Council was approved as presented.]*

#### CLOSING REMARKS

**Mr. Schiner:** The steering committee and Division III membership would like to commend you for your outstanding leadership and commitment to Division III athletics during your tenure as vice-president. Your vision for the future growth and development of our division has been a great value in the restructuring process. I ask the membership to join me in thanking you for a job extremely well done. (Applause)

**Mr. Coll:** Thank you. The vice-president convenes this meeting. The newly elected vice-president will adjourn it. Before I call Bridget forward to adjourn this meeting, I simply want all of you to know how thoroughly I've enjoyed my experience over the last few years, of the wonderful friendships that I have developed, of being associated with the Association during this terribly exciting time. I simply want you to know how grateful I am that you provided me the opportunity to be of service to you. So thank you all very much. Bridget, the meeting is yours. (Applause)

**Bridget Belgiovine** (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): I would like to personally thank Ed and all of the members of the Division III Steering Committee. It is truly an honor to represent this division within this Association. I hope to represent us in the next couple of years in the fashion that all of those who have preceded me have done.

In closing, if we think the last year has been trying with restructuring, then what we have ahead of us is clearly a bit more work that we have to give. You've heard it the last two days. Your input and your comments are valuable for this division and for our future. What we will do in the next two years is going to carve the long-term future of this division and the commitment to our student-athletes within Division III. I encourage you to continue to give us your comments, supply them to any one of the members of the Division III Steering Committee and not give up on what is a very good division. Are there other issues that anyone would like to bring forward at this time? Comments to be made? With that, I now call this Division III business session closed.

*[The Division III business session was adjourned at 10:10 a.m.]*

## Division I Business Session

Monday Morning, January 8, 1996

The Division I business session was called to order at 12:30 p.m., with Robert M. Sweazy, faculty athletics representative, Texas Tech University, presiding.

#### OPENING REMARKS

**Mr. Sweazy:** The Division I business session will now come to order. Unless you are new to this Convention, you no doubt realize that I am not Bill Sangster. Unfortunately, Bill is ill and unable to be here, therefore, I am pinch-hitting. I am Bob Sweazy, the faculty athletics representative from Texas Tech University. I will preside over the Division I business session today and tomorrow. Our primary task today is to complete the Presidential Agenda Day portion of the agenda for the Division I business session.

*[Note: Revisions to the Convention Program were announced and voting procedures were explained.]*

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

**Mr. Sweazy:** We are now ready to begin this afternoon's voting with Proposal No. 7.

##### NCAA Membership Restructuring

**Kenneth A. Shaw** (Syracuse University): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposals Nos. 7-G, 7-K, 7-N, 7-R, 7-Z, 7-EE and 7-GG.

*[The motion was seconded.]*

As the cochair of the Division I Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure, and on behalf of the Presidents Commission and the NCAA Council, I would like to speak in favor of the Division I governance plan.

During the past 18 months, the group that was selected to reorganize the Division I governance model has met many times and shared numerous ideas. Our division is fortunate that we are able to organize such a large and diverse task force. The men and the women from all three subdivisions that were a part of the task force have worked hard to develop a plan that is acceptable to all constituencies in Division I. After considering many models, the task force agreed that a representative system of governance was needed to operate more efficiently as a division. This change will provide our leadership with the governance system that allows for a more immediate response to our division's legislative needs and to the changing conditions in intercollegiate athletics.

In addition, this new system will provide greater representation and authority to those institutions that are the focus of most of the public's attention and that devote the greatest amount of resources to intercol-



legiate athletics. This decision to establish a representative system of governance was not reached without a thorough discussion, without deliberation and consideration. As a compromise to providing Division I-A with greater representation in our legislative process, a number of checks on Division I-A's authority was built into the membership restructuring proposals.

For example, a process exists that will permit the membership to override actions taken by the Division I representatives that we will all select. If at least 30 Division I schools disagree with the Division I legislative action, then the entire division's membership will have an opportunity to vote to override the action in question, and that override will occur with a five-eighths majority vote. Another important feature in the Division I governance plan is the legislation that establishes notice requirements. Throughout the Division I legislative process, the Division I membership will be informed of legislative developments, so schools can communicate comments and positions to conference representatives.

Additionally, Proposal No. 7-G guarantees that the current Division I distribution formula will continue to be used to allocate the revenue provided to Division I. In a few minutes, you will consider amendment-to-amendment No. 7-2 that provides greater specificity as to what these revenue formulas are. The Oversight Committee on the NCAA Membership Structure recently agreed to support this amendment-to-amendment as a show of good faith and trust among the subdivisions.

Finally, with regard to diversity, the men and women on the Division I task force decided against guaranteeing specific numbers of positions for genders, ethnicities or staff positions in this representative system of governance. The Presidents Commission and the Council have studied this issue and support the task force's decision. While guaranteed positions are not legislative, the Presidents Commission and Council are confident that the new structure will provide minorities with greater opportunities to participate in our division management.

Never before has there been as many leadership positions available in Division I as there will be in this new structure. The Commission and Council believe that it is important that each conference and institution commit itself to identifying and developing a diverse slate of candidates for these management positions. The onus for diversity in this new system must be placed at the conference and institutional levels. As an aside, I might add that the Commission further supports Resolution 9, which deals with diversity and will be acted upon later.

Compromise in accommodation has allowed us to develop a plan that benefits each subdivision. This is why the Presidents Commission and the Council have enthusiastically endorsed this Division I governance plan. On behalf of the Commission and the Council, I now urge your support for Proposals Nos. 7-G, 7-K, 7-N- 7-R, 7-Z, 7-EE and 7-GG. Thank you.

**Constance H. Hurlbut** (Patriot League): On behalf of the sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 7-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

A constitutional guarantee of the revenue-distribution formula is an essential element of the restructuring proposal for Division I. This amendment specifies that guarantee. It should be noted that the sponsors do not intend to prevent increased allocations of revenue to the mutual components of the revenue-sharing plan, including specifically the conference grants and special assistance in the academic enhancement fund.

I, too, want to note that the Council and the Commission supported this proposal. On behalf of the sponsors, I urge your support.

**Mr. Shaw:** On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 7-2. The committee agreed to support the adoption of this amendment as a demonstration of good faith to our colleagues in Divisions I-AA and I-AAA. It is a step in creating greater trust in institutions in Division I.

It is the oversight committee's understanding that the sponsors of this amendment have agreed that any adjustment or fine-tuning to this revenue guarantee may be made during the Division I governance system's transition period, if necessary. So, on behalf of the Commission and the Council, I urge your support for amendment No. 7-2.

[Proposal No. 7-2 (Page A-39) was adopted, 321-4.]

**Carol J. Sprague** (University of Pittsburgh): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 7-3.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 7-3. One of the fundamental guarantees provided to Divisions I-AA and I-AAA during the restructuring negotiations was access to national championships at least at the level provided at the time of the adoption of the restructuring legislation. This amendment specifies the guarantee as it was agreed to by the Division I Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure. In fact, the language added to the legislation by amendment No. 7-3 is taken directly from the Division I task force restructuring report. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of 7-3.

[Proposal No. 7-3 (Page A-40) was adopted, 326-1.]

**Richard J. Ensor** (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 7-5-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal 7-5-A. This amendment gives all Divisions I-AA and I-AAA conferences their guaranteed representation in the Division I structure and that this representation will be in effect for as long as those conferences continue to meet the appropriate membership criteria.

This amendment merely provides Divisions I-AA and I-AAA conferences the same guarantees and protections that the Division I-A conferences now receive. On behalf of the Council, we urge your support for amendment No. 7-5-A.

**Mr. Sweazy:** Thank you. Just a moment, Rich. Were your remarks pertinent to 7-5-A or 7-6-A?

**Mr. Ensor:** According to my script, it is 7-5-A. If I can just look at it, I can tell you.

**Mr. Sweazy:** We can actually treat 7-6-A first. I am advised those

*Division I Business Session*

207



remarks were probably pertinent to 7-6-A.

Are the delegates ready to vote on 7-6-A? We will come back and treat 7-5-A in just a moment. The remarks you have heard were pertinent to 7-6-A.

[Part A of Proposal No. 7-6 (Page A-42) was adopted, 318-0.]

**Samuel H. Smith** (Washington State University): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal 7-5-a.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the newly elected chair of the Presidents Commission, I would like to speak in favor of this amendment. For the first time in the history of our Association, this restructuring legislation will relate the responsibility for assuring a diverse representation in the Division I governance structure for the university presidents and chancellors.

Thus, Division I chief executive officers on the Board of Directors will have the authority to require of any governing group, including the Board, to alter its membership if the group does not include diverse representation. The purpose of this amendment is to reinforce that gender and ethnic diversity must be a primary responsibility of the conferences when they identify nominees for the Division I Board of Directors.

Again, if this amendment is not demonstrated, the CEOs on the Board of Directors will ask that the nomination process be redone so that there will be some diversity. On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge your support for this amendment.

**Edward B. Fort** (North Carolina A&T State University): I strongly support the remarks by the previous speaker. I call the attention of the body, as mentioned earlier today, that there is an acutely important relationship between 7-5-A as it pertains to the gender and ethnic diversity and what the presidents have established with regard to Proposal No. 9, which we will speak to later.

It is urged in the strongest terms possible that not only does this body take action to deal properly with 7-5-A, but that it take under advisement the actual plan that will be conceptualized and then authorized, hopefully, by the transition team over the next 18 months as codified in No. 9. So, again, with No. 9 as the benchmark, we strongly urge the passage of 7-5-A.

**William B. DeLauder** (Delaware State University): I support Proposal 7-5-A. The NCAA and its members should be about students. There is no other reason for this organization to exist. We must be about the business of providing opportunities for students to earn a high-quality education and at the same time to participate and obtain the educational developmental benefits that such participation can provide.

We have a very diverse student-athlete population. It is imperative that the Board of Directors and the Management Council include individuals who have insight and sensitivity toward the needs and challenges of students from various ethnic, racial and/or socio-economic backgrounds. I will remind you that 29 percent of all students on aid are minorities. In the major revenue sports, basketball and football, African-Americans constitute about 65 percent and 51 percent, respectfully. We must have representatives on these governance bodies

who can speak to and represent the interests of all of our student-athletes. This concept is critical, as expressed in 7-5-A, and I urge your support.

[Part A of Proposal No. 7-5 (Page A-41) was adopted, 325-1.]

**Nelson E. Bobb** (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): I seek a point of clarification for the formula provided in "K". Those who framed the division restructuring package were very clear in their requirement that a select set of Division I conferences be identified as "equity" conferences. These conferences were chosen so as to give division I-A a majority position on the Executive Committee, and the Division I Board of Directors a plurality position on the Division I Management Council. This was justified on the basis that those members are the focus of most of the public attention on intercollegiate athletics and devote the greatest amount of resources to their intercollegiate athletics programs and should have greater control of their own destinies.

The set of equity conferences were chosen with greatest attention to Division I-A conferences that compete for superiority in football. While it is eminently clear why so many want a conference designated as an equity conference, considering the amount of their budgetary commitments, it is not clear as to the selection of all conferences so designated. I would like to ask someone, perhaps a member of the Division I oversight committee, to explain the basis on which Conference USA was so designated.

**Mr. Sweazy**: Would anyone from the task force or the oversight committee like to address that question? Certainly, no one up here is knowledgeable in that regard. Seeing no one approaching the microphone, I think you might have to have a private consultation with a member of the oversight committee or the Division I task force.

**Mr. Bobb**: With all due respect, this morning Christine Grant from Iowa brought up a very good point about questioning the infrastructure, if you will, of this decision that the NCAA decided upon. I think it would be fair since we have taken so much time and effort—and I fully understand the decision relative to equity to conferences, I understand that very clearly and I think many of us do—to have an answer.

**Kenneth Shaw** (Syracuse University): After giving serious thought to your question, and after tapping the best minds on the divisional committee, I can say to you without equivocation that it seemed to be a very good idea at the time. Those who agreed to it continue to think it is a very good idea. It is really a question of trying to balance the various interests and the compromises that we had to make in order to make this package come together. It was necessary. It was believed the representatives from the eight conferences made the package come together.

**Mr. Sweazy**: Thank you, Chancellor Shaw. I trust that addresses your question. Once again, we are ready to vote on 7-K, as amended by 7-5-A and 7-6-A.

[Part K of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) was adopted as amended by Nos. 7-5-A and 7-6-A, 311-16.]

**Sammuel H. Smith** (Washington State University): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission, I move the adoption of Proposal

*Division I Business Session*

209



No. 7-5-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I would like to speak in favor of this amendment. As I mentioned earlier, for the first time in the history of our Association, this restructuring legislation will place responsibility for ensuring diversity of representation to the Division I governance structure with the university presidents and chancellors. Thus, Division I CEOs and the Board of Directors will have the authority to require any governing group, including the Division I Management Council, to alter its membership where the group does not include diversity of representation.

The purpose of this amendment is to reinforce that gender and ethnic diversity must be a primary consideration of conferences as they identify nominees for the Management Council. Again, if this commitment is not demonstrated, the CEOs and the Board of Directors will ask that the nominating process be done so that due weight is given to such diversity. On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge your support of this amendment.

[Part B of Proposal No. 7-5 (Page A-41) was adopted, 323-1-2.]

**Richard J. Ensor** (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): After careful review of my script and on behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 7-6-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal 7-6-B. As mentioned earlier, this amendment will give Divisions I-AA and I-AAA conferences guaranteed representation in the Division I structure. That representation will be maintained as long as those conferences continue to meet the appropriate membership criteria. This amendment merely provides the Divisions I-AA and I-AAA conferences the same guarantees and protections that Division I-A conferences have received. In addition, the amendment will give Divisions I-AA and I-AAA greater flexibility to have Council representation in the position. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of 7-6-B.

[Part B of Proposal No. 7-6 (Page A-42) was adopted, 324-0.]

**Mr. Sweazy:** We are now ready to vote on 7-N, as amended.

[Part N of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) was adopted as amended by Nos. 7-5-B and 7-6-B, 310-4.]

**James Jarrett** (Old Dominion University): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 7-R. This section deletes geographical regions for purposes of a Division I governance system since representatives to the reorganized Division I structure will be selected by conference affiliation and not geographical location.

For the first time in our division's history, every institution will be guaranteed representation in the Division I governance structure. As mentioned, such representation will be based on an institution's conference affiliation. On behalf of the Presidents Commission and Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 7-R.

[Part R of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) was adopted, 312-1.]

**Jeffrey Orleans** (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 7-9-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would eliminate the provision, which would otherwise carry-over in the current structure, that would allow the subdivisions of Division I to vote separately on nonfootball items. Maintaining that separate voting in a new and unified system of governance has the potential to be quite divisive. In a system that is now fully representative, the voting system is now unnecessary. We would strongly recommend that this body approve this amendment and delete the provision for separate voting on the nonfootball items.

**Kenneth Shaw** (Syracuse University): I want to support my colleague from the Ivy League. On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 7-9. The Presidents Commission believes that the authority that currently exists for separate subdivision action on issues unrelated to the sport of football is unnecessary in this new structure. This authority has, at least to the knowledge of Roy Kramer, never been used over the last 90 years. The Commission does not believe that Proposal No. 7-9 alters the compromises and accommodations that have been agreed to during the restructuring process.

We believe, as a matter of fact, it supports what we have been doing. On behalf of the Commission, I urge your support for Proposal No. 7-9.

[Part A of Proposal No. 7-9 (Page A-44) was adopted, 297-28-1.]

**James Jarrett** (Old Dominion University): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 7-EE. This section of the legislation, combined with section 7-DD, was adopted during the general business session this morning. It completes the deletion of the current system of governance in Division I, whereby the division's specific legislation is amended by the Council for Conventions and Division I legislative meetings. This step must be taken for the Division I representative system of governance to be established as our primary method of conducting Division I business. The new system is the heart and soul of the Division I restructuring plan.

This representative system will be considered in a few minutes for membership votes on Proposal 7-GG. As Chancellor Shaw mentioned earlier, the position to establish a representative system of governance through Division I was made only after extensive debate and consideration by task force representatives from all three subdivisions. As you have heard, this new system provides our division with a more efficient and immediate legislative process. It also has features that will protect the concepts of institutional participation in our division's legislative process, such as the membership override process. On behalf of the Presidents Commission and Council, I urge your support for 7-EE.

[Part EE of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) was adopted, 308-3-1.]

**Jeffrey H. Orleans** (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 7-9-B.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal completes the deletion of the separate nonfootball voting, which we began just a minute ago, and the argument is the same. I would again urge this body to adopt it.



student-athletes that we support Proposal 19.

**Edward B. Fort** (North Carolina A&T State University): The previous speaker has done well in relationship to the key issues as it pertains to why it is important that No. 19 be passed. The fact of the matter is that the passage of Proposal 19 will serve to ameliorate the difficulties that are associated negatively as far as the implementation of No. 16 is concerned by the fall of 1996.

Therefore, in order for us to achieve that end, it is important that a de facto amendment to No. 16 be approved. The only way to do that is by voting "yes" on No. 19. So, we are suggesting and, in fact, urging in the strongest terms possible that the body say "yes" on No. 19.

**Michael B. McGee** (University of South Carolina, Columbia): Many of you here can recall that Prop 48, the first major step in academic reform, was phased in with increasing standards over a three-year period. I think that most would agree that the transitional period was advantageous to the young people then in high school and crucial to the successful introduction of higher standards.

In many respects, Proposal 19 provides similar advantages. We grant the opportunity for today's young people to matriculate to our campuses without the competitive pressures now encountered and through a more limited term of eligibility with heightened academic incentives. More importantly, Prop 19 will afford us the occasion to carefully and thoroughly analyze empirical data to consider the likely negative impact of No. 16 upon opportunity and access of our minority prospective student-athletes. Thank you.

**Steven B. Sample** (University of Southern California): I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 19 in the hopes that my fellow delegates will vote it down.

Let me say at the outset that Proposal 19, contrary to what you have heard earlier, represents a major retreat from Proposal 16, which we adopted last year. I live and work in the County of Los Angeles. It is a county of 10 million people. We have so many minorities in the County of Los Angeles that we no longer have an ethnic group that is, in fact, the majority. There is nothing in the current standards that prevents any student from becoming a partial qualifier. There is nothing in the current standards that cannot be readily met by every student in our schools today, Black, white, Hispanic, Asian.

Every student can meet those standards that we adopted last year. For us to retreat from those standards now short-changes and cheats the young people of the United States. One thing we know in the County of Los Angeles and one thing we know in the United States is that nothing has done more to raise standards in our inner-city schools than Prop 48. That is not speculation, ladies and gentlemen. That is a measurable, established fact. There is a very simple reason for it. The reason is that, especially in our inner-city schools, student-athletes are the role models. When the NCAA began to adopt slightly higher standards for student-athletes, the standards for all students went up.

Now, no one is saying today that a student couldn't meet the Prop 48 standards. You will notice that. No one is making that argument today. The reason is that the Prop 48 standards are very easy for any student to meet. The Prop 16 standards of last year are easy to meet

and indeed will be met by every student-athlete who wants to compete at the collegiate level. But the really good news is that if we can stand firm and not fold under pressure today, because of Prop 19 adopted last year, standards for all of our inner-city students and all of our minority students are going to go up dramatically in this country, as they did when we adopted Prop 48.

I live and work in that environment in Los Angeles. I do not believe that Prop 19 is going to do good things for minority students. Ladies and gentlemen, I want to say unequivocally that adoption of Prop 19 today will do bad things for minority students throughout the country. I urge you to vote it down. Thank you.

**Jeffrey H. Orleans** (Ivy Group): We have heard a lot of discussion about the lack of need for this measure as a transitional measure. I would like to ask the proponent of this measure who identified this as a transitional measure why it doesn't have a sunset of two or three years? I would also be interested in hearing from Jerry Kingston to see if he would be willing to support this if it has a sunset of two years.

**Mr. Kingston:** I had the opportunity to respond to that in the Council discussion and the Division I Steering Committee several days ago. I would not support the proposal if it had a one- or two-year phase-in period. In fact, ladies and gentlemen, we have had a one-year phase-in period because we delayed the index from the 1995 to the 1996 legislation. We have already had a phase-in year because this proposal was originally to be enacted as of August 1, 1995. Now we are talking about whether we are going to implement it in its present form on August 1, 1996. So, in fact, we have allowed for a one-year phase-in period by moving from 11 to 13 core courses.

**Mr. Gordon:** In Orange County, right near Los Angeles County, naturally we would all like to be able to give a definitive response using statistics to prove the results of No. 16, 19, or any of these other proposals that rely on this kind of development; unfortunately, that doesn't exist. So all of the comments made are on judgment. I guess what the supporters of Proposal No. 19 are asking you to do is to independently make the decision. Proposal 19 is betting on the students. These students have been in our institutions, they have been successful.

By the results of the previous decisions, they are now nonqualifiers. So to give them an opportunity of a partial qualifier is actually betting on them. This is what we are asking you to do. Thank you.

**Thomas E. Yeager** (Colonial Athletic Association): I don't intend to try to quote long statistics or anything else. I think that maybe a bit of perspective might help us go through here. When Proposal No. 16 was adopted, there was a clear line that a student needed to cross to become eligible.

Last year, we decided to build a bridge to cross that valley from Prop 48 to Prop 16. Prop 19 does nothing. If we eroded Prop 16, then we did it last year in adopting an index. We have now started to build a bridge and we have found, lo and behold, that it is incomplete. This bridge can't get us over the valley. I think the philosophy in building this bridge was that those students who were eligible under No. 48 at worst become partial qualifiers on the part of Proposal No. 16. We did



that in good faith when we adopted that. Now, we start to come to the realization that what we adopted last year in good intentions is incomplete and that this is almost something that completes those good intentions.

Those who speak and think that this is an erosion of the standard, I would argue that we did that. We gave away Proposal 16. We did that last year. We need to do it now, in deference to our student-athletes. It seems one of the earlier speakers said that we have taken a situation where kids who were not eligible under Prop 48 and increased their eligibility status. Those kids who now have been eligible under Prop 48, are in a lesser eligibility status. I would urge the adoption of Proposal No. 19.

[Proposal No. 19 (Page A-75) was defeated, 161-163-6.]

#### **Partial Qualifier—Division I**

**Roy Kramer** (Southeastern Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

Based on the previous discussion and previous vote, we would ask the Convention to seriously consider Proposal No. 18, which is not a reduction in standards, but an increase in standards because it does alter the partial qualifier category. However, it alters it by raising the grade-point average to 2.250 and 700 on the SAT, with 13 core courses. Considerably stronger than the previous Prop 48, this is an increase in standards and it is not a step backward. It is an opportunity to provide a limited number of student-athletes who are former qualifiers, but clearly qualify for the institutions in this room, at least to take the step to be a partial qualifier and not be alienated forever as a nonqualifier and then be recycled back to us through one of the most controversial processes that we have at the present time—the junior college.

I would strongly urge if you do not support No. 19, because you thought you could not take a slight step backward, to seriously consider No. 18. I move that we pass 18 and open this opportunity for our student-athletes. Thank you. Chairman Sweazy: Thank you.

[Proposal No. 18 (Page A-74) was defeated, 150-178.]

#### **Initial Eligibility—Partial Qualifier—Division I**

**Larry Gerlach** (University of Utah): On behalf of the sponsors, I move adoption of Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

For the past several years, amendments that have allowed student-athletes who do not meet initial-eligibility requirements to earn back the fourth year of competition have been discussed intensively and defeated narrowly with margins ranging from 12 to 15 votes out of some 300 cast. The closeness of the votes and the persistence of the proposal indicates that the Association is almost equally divided on important issues that have not yet been resolved to the general satisfaction of the membership. Proposal No. 20 is an effort, finally, to resolve the matter by offering both a more educationally sound bylaw than the current legislation scheduled to take effect on August 1, and a compromise between those who feel students failing to meet the initial-eligibility standards should be penalized as an incentive for academic prepara-

tion in high school and those who feel that partial qualifiers meeting satisfactory progress requirements in college should be allowed to earn a fourth year of competition.

During the past debates on this issue, the proponents of the fourth-year option voiced concerns about sending wrong messages. I agree, but would argue that by allowing partial qualifiers to practice during the first year of enrollment and precluding a possible fourth year of competition, the present legislation sends the wrong message. Indeed, it sends two wrong messages.

First, to allow partial qualifiers, who admittedly by definition are at-risk student-athletes, to practice during the initial year of enrollment sends the wrong message. The message is that institutions are more interested in athletics development than academic preparation. Practice is a time-consuming and emotionally consuming activity that demands far beyond 20 hours per week. That is especially true in football and in men's basketball, the two sports most impacted by initial-eligibility legislation and that demand the time and attention of student-athletes very early in the academic year. Our primary concern should be the preparation of all academic at-risk youngsters for long-term educational success rather than the short-term objective of preparing them for athletics competition.

Second, to deny partial qualifiers the opportunity to earn a fourth year of competition also sends the wrong message. The message is that you'll suffer irrevocable penalties for academic shortcomings in high school rather than recognizing the accomplishments of collegians who remedy past academic deficiencies and advance to the same standards of academic achievement as qualifiers. Redemption, here in the form of a second chance for meeting academic requirements in college, is an important and positive message to be conveyed to young people. That is why the faculty athletics representatives, who met at the annual FAR meeting in November, overwhelmingly endorsed Proposal No. 20 in its entirety. Current legislation not only sends the wrong message, it formulates the wrong response to the problem. I concur that a penalty should be imposed for taking care of business in high school. Make no mistake about it, inability to participate in sports for a year is no small penalty for high-profile athletes. But it seems more reasonable that the penalty for not meeting academic expectations in high school should come on the front end of the collegiate experience and should couple a negative consequence—no participation in athletics—with a positive outcome—concentration on athletics.

What in the end is the purpose of initial-eligibility legislation? Is it simply to punish youngsters' shortcomings in high school, or is it to provide the opportunity for less well-prepared high-school students to remedy academic deficiencies before participating in athletics, and thereby increase the likelihood of graduation by imposing a significant penalty for not meeting the initial-eligibility requirements in high school, while allowing for a second chance to those who meet the Association's satisfactory-progress requirements in college? Proposal 20 sends the right messages and appropriately addresses the special circumstances of partial qualifiers. I urge your support of Proposal No. 20.



**Donald G. Morrison** (University of California, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Pacific-10 Conference, I would like to move that we separate Section D and vote separately on that.

[The motion was seconded the defeated.]

**William E. Kirwan** (University of Maryland, College Park): The sponsors of Proposal No. 20 offered it as a compromise. Let partial qualifiers earn back the fourth season, but deny them an opportunity to practice their first year. This proposal should be defeated on both grounds.

As recently as last January, the membership of the NCAA affirmed the value of having partial qualifiers practice but not compete in their first year. I will not repeat all the arguments given last year. Let me just say there is widespread belief that the opportunity for partial qualifiers to practice in their first year is deemed important, both in the development of their athletics skills and for their assimilation into the campus community.

The other piece of this proposal, allowing a partial qualifier to earn a fourth season of competition, ignores a very important point. The purpose of allowing partial qualifiers only three years of competition is not to penalize partial qualifiers, rather the purpose is to send a strong message to all students in junior high school and high school that there is a genuine reward for successfully meeting NCAA academic standards. Let's not dilute that message. Let's not compromise the interest of the many for the carrot of an extra season for a few. On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge you to defeat Proposal No. 20.

**Vivian L. Fuller** (Northeastern Illinois University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 20. The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee has had the opportunity throughout this decade to consider whether a student should be permitted to practice as a freshman if they do not satisfy all of the initial-eligibility requirements. Generally, the committee has expressed support of giving partial qualifiers the opportunity to practice during the first year. The committee and the Council believe that the involvement helped with the student assimilation and often provides a necessary structure that may benefit many student-athletes.

We believe that the action at last year's Convention to permit partial qualifiers to practice during the initial year will have a positive result. Proposal No. 20 eliminates this opportunity. In addition, the Council opposes the establishment of four seasons of eligibility for partial qualifiers because of the message that it will send to prospects regarding the employment of academic preparations.

Let us make no mistake, our initial-eligibility standards speak loudly about our expectations for academic preparation of young people coming into our colleges and universities. We need to continue to send that strong message. On behalf of the Council, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 20.

**Clayton W. Chapman** (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Eastern College Athletic Conference, I ask that you support Proposal No. 20.

We believe that partial qualifiers who meet satisfactory progress

should have an opportunity to earn back the fourth season of competition. Although a partial qualifier has practiced during the first academic year and it may help the student-athlete to be physically prepared for competition, the focus should be more on academics. While we believe that it is important to encourage the academic progress of high-school students, we also believe that this encouragement should extend throughout his or her collegiate enrollment.

Giving a partial qualifier the opportunity to earn back a full season of competition gives the partial qualifier more incentive to work toward his or her degree and the desire to practice during his or her first year of collegiate enrollment. Please vote in favor of Proposal No. 20.

**David R. Hart Jr.** (Florida State University): This may correct the record or may demonstrate my life's period. The Legislative Review Committee by majority vote voted to oppose the fourth season of eligibility. I believe that was the view FARA expressed, which would be contrary to the suggestion that it was overwhelmingly in support of this proposal. I believe that FARA is on record opposing the fourth year of eligibility. I would urge you to defeat it because of the use that recruiting coaches might make of this proposal. Prospects will be told they can take a redshirt year and not worry about what happens in high school, we will get you four years of competition at our institution. This would wreck the reform.

**Eric L. Nedeau** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Northeastern University): Performance in the college classroom is a true indicator of a student-athlete's potential studies. Cases involving close friends and fellow teammates show us that partial-qualifier student-athletes are capable of achieving as much, if not more, in the college classroom than others who are deemed to be qualifiers.

These student-athletes are mandated to watch from the sidelines during their freshman year rather than being able to compete in an effort to acclimate themselves to the academic process. Passage of this proposal would serve as a vital organizational tool, because it offers a partial qualifier an invaluable incentive—a fourth year of eligibility—to help them complete their academic requirements. By staying on course for degree completion and meeting the requirements leading to a timely graduation, as set forth by both you, the NCAA and the individual institution, these particular student-athletes should be rewarded with a final year of eligibility.

We must keep in mind that this is not a gift, a handout, nor a form of retribution. It is a tangible reward. It is a reward for those students who have overcome adversity and excelled in the classroom when there were indications and members here who said they couldn't. It will provide an opportunity to not only earn back their fourth year, but to erase the stigma that the partial qualifier label that was placed upon them has left. In response to some of the arguments saying that a student-athlete would prefer to practice for that first year rather than have their fourth year of eligibility, I am going to tell you that is not true. I am a student-athlete. I have got close friends. One of my best friends came in as a partial qualifier as a result of dyslexia. He did not make the 700, but he did make the grade point. One of the things he said in talking to me before coming out here, "I would rather



take that fourth year of eligibility." He said that is what you look for and said, "I will give up practice to get ready to make the grade as long as I can have that fourth year."

Unfortunately for him, that is not going to happen. But for other student-athletes that come into this who are classified as partial qualifiers, we urge your support of this proposal so they do have that opportunity. Thank you.

**Frederick S. Humphries** (Florida A&M University): I would like to point out to the body that today, even in the NCAA and even outside the NCAA, we measure the average graduation rate by six years of attendance, not by five, not by four, not three. That is six years.

Our move toward reform is invested in the notion that we are trying to improve academic standards and put our emphasis on education. It seems to me that we behave kind of inconsistently when we talk about how we want to get a person partially qualified and then only give them three years to get a degree when all of that goes against everything we know to be important and logical in our process of educating other students.

I want to urge the Convention to be logical. If we do permit the partial qualifier, then we ought to act like we want to educate them. If we want to act like we want to educate them, we need to be realistic in the time that is required for graduation.

We ought to make a decision in the interest of that young person to educate them. I think that that requires adding a fourth year. You can make the athletics decisions, but I think the educational decision requires that we give that kid the time because he is a partial qualifier and not well-prepared for higher education. We ought to give that kid the time that it takes to be educated. I urge you to vote for Proposal No. 20.

**Jerry L. Kingston** (Arizona State University): By a very close vote a few minutes ago, we have now created a situation in which everyone who is currently eligible under our existing standards now will be allowed to practice and receive athletically related financial aid as a freshman.

Last year, we added to that group Proposal No. 19, which would allow students who are currently eligible under Prop 48 to be identified as partial qualifiers and to receive athletically related aid.

**Larry R. Gerlach** (University of Utah): A point of clarification and then a comment. Professor Hart wanted the record to read correctly, and I think it should because he misstated what has happened. The Faculty Athletics Representatives Association's legislative committee was split three to two on this issue, three opposing and two favoring.

At the Atlanta meeting of November 16-17, the Division I faculty athletics representatives overwhelmingly supported this proposal in its entirety and it so stated in the memo sent to all faculty athletics representatives. You should note that the Council, while opposing this proposal, supports Proposal 23-1, which would exempt the "mandatory redshirt year" for a nonqualifier or a partial qualifier transferring from a junior college who has, to quote from the rationale, "demonstrated significant academic achievement at the two-year college and is on track to complete baccalaureate-degree requirements." Should

not the same rationale apply to academically successful partial qualifiers at four-year schools?

**Thomas K. Hearn Jr.** (Wake Forest University): In the real world of recruiting, what we have now is a situation in which young men and women are struggling to qualify. If we pass this allowance, in the real world of recruiting the first coach who says to a prospect, particularly a high-profile blue chip prospect: "Don't worry about meeting the standards. We are going to take care of you. You will have a year at our school to get bigger, stronger, meaner and faster. Then you will play for four years and you will have a degree. You don't need to worry about whether or not you meet the standards that are presently set."

To adopt this is to set aside everything that we have done in the last decade. I urge you not to let this happen.

**Khalid Channell** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of California, Irvine): I would like to point out a quick paradox. In a situation with two students, one meeting initial-eligibility requirements and the other not meeting initial-eligible requirements, both must meet satisfactory progress in order to compete in intercollegiate athletics after initial enrollment in a Division I institution. The student who meets satisfactory progress by a narrow margin must still make "progress" during the particular year and thus be eligible for competition during the following year. This student, however, after competing during the previous year could be eligible the subsequent year and thus have the opportunity to compete in the four seasons of competition even though he does not meet satisfactory progress during one academic year.

On the other hand, the student with the partial qualifier status who meets the satisfactory progress in all of his or her years of enrollment at the institution would only be permitted to participate in three seasons of competition.

[Proposal No. 20 (Page A-76) was defeated, 102-220-6.]

#### **Initial Eligibility—Partial Qualifier—Division I**

**George A. Bohlen** (University of Dayton): On behalf of the Atlantic 10 Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal permits student-athletes who are able to successfully complete the baccalaureate-degree requirements in four calendar years to earn a fourth year of eligibility if they are able to publicly remove the partial qualifier stigma that otherwise remains with the student-athlete throughout his or her life. This provides the opportunity for those who have been misguided or experienced trauma or other negative things during their teenage years to overcome the penalties of the partial-qualifier status. We believe that the proposal is academically sound and represents the concerns of those who emphasize raising initial academic eligibility standards to achieve higher graduation rates and those who think the criteria used to establish initial academic eligibility are not always an accurate indication of the prospect receiving their baccalaureate degree.

We believe that a partial qualifier who completes the baccalaureate degree requirement prior to the beginning of his or her fifth academic year, following the student's initial full-time collegiate enrollment,



should be granted the fourth season of competition. Proposals like this have been on the floor in recent years and have failed. This proposal is significantly different in that it applies to partial qualifiers only. If the student-athletes actually have a degree in hand or a diploma, they are advanced to degree status.

Additionally and importantly, to increase academic standards of qualifiers, it also increases the intercollegiate standards for partial qualifiers. Any number of students who are partial qualifiers under the new criteria would have been a qualifier prior to August 1996. In summary, those partial qualifiers who have the ability and the motivation to complete the degree requirements in four years can get back the fourth year of eligibility.

**Erik Nedeau** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Northeastern University): Similar to our reason for supporting Proposal No. 20, our committee encourages the adoption of Proposition No. 21. Although this committee feels very strongly that partial qualifiers deserve the opportunity to earn a fourth year of eligibility, regardless of their attainment of the baccalaureate degree, adoption of the current proposal would open the fourth year of eligibility to some partial qualifiers and should, therefore, be supported. Thank you.

**Brother Thomas J. Scanlan** (Manhattan College): On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge you to oppose Proposal No. 21. Since we have already heard many of the arguments on Proposal No. 20, I will leave most of my script on the table and spare you a repeat and only mention the fact that after a student has earned a four-year scholarship and played for three years and graduated in four, it is the custom in our institutions to say to them on graduation day: "Good luck. Go on with the rest of your life."

[Proposal No. 21 (Page A-78) was defeated, 122-196-2.]

#### **Reconsideration of Partial Qualifier—Division I**

**Patricia A. Sullivan** (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): Having voted on the prevailing side on Proposal No. 19, and in view of the narrowness of the vote and with the understanding that next year's Convention is a legislative Convention including all members, I request reconsideration of Proposal No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Edward B. Fort** (North Carolina A&T State University): In concert with the noble move made by my colleague, Dr. Sullivan, I would respectfully request that you define the circumstances, the conditions and the time frame within which a vote for reconsideration on Proposal 19 would occur.

**Mr. Sweazy:** We have already gotten a motion to reconsider. It can occur now. The last opportunity to reconsider is this afternoon's session at 4 o'clock. But we only get one chance to reconsider. It has already been moved, so we are going to vote on it.

**Mr. Fort:** Given the fact that you have responded to my question, then I would request respectfully of the chair that you allow the deferential until the time frame of 4 p.m.

What are the conditions? What are the ground rules? You have set the ground rules and, therefore, I would like to take advantage of those ground rules by asking respectfully that you allow us to defer

until 4 o'clock or after.

**Mr. Sweazy:** The ground rules have been explained previously, but if the maker of the motion wishes to withdraw it, the chair will honor that.

**Mr. Fort:** If you withdraw it, does that negates the whole process?

**Mr. Sweazy:** She can make the motion again in the 4 o'clock session.

**Mr. Fort:** Fine. I will defer to Chancellor Sullivan.

**Ms. Sullivan:** In the interest of discussion, I am willing to withdraw the motion with the understanding that I can bring it back at 4 p.m. Is that the understanding?

**Mr. Sweazy:** Yes, ma'am. If the person who seconded the motion agrees to withdraw it at this time.

**Mr. Farrell:** I agree.

#### **Two-Year College Transfers—Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier—Division I**

**Charles Whitcomb** (San Jose State University): On behalf of the Council, the Presidents Commission and the Academic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal requires students who are partial qualifiers and non-qualifiers and who are two-year college transfer students in Division I football and men's basketball, to fulfill an academic year in residence prior to participating in competition. The student would still be eligible for practice in athletics during that year that he needs transfer requirements. This proposal will give these students a more reasonable chance to succeed academically at the four-year institution to which they transfer because they will have the year that is likely to be in a much more rigorous academic environment at the four-year school before they also have to face rigors of competition.

Under the current satisfactory-progress percentage requirements in Division I, students must have 25 percent of their degree requirements upon entry in their third year of college enrollment, 50 percent upon entering their fourth year and 75 percent upon their fifth year. This proposal encourages Division I institutions recruiting these students to get them closer to graduation and will require that they have successfully completed 75 percent of their degree in order to participate in a fourth season of competition as opposed to only 50 percent under the current rule.

It is only reasonable to require our schools to make such a commitment to the academic success of these students, especially since they contribute to the successes of our athletics programs in these sports. I urge you to adopt this legislation. Thank you.

**Robert W. Lawless** (Texas Tech University): I move Proposal No. 23-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

On this particular amendment, we would like to move to support No. 23-2 in the sense of modifying the previous level of 40 percent of satisfactory progress. We believe that it is important to acknowledge the students who are nonqualifiers and go to a community college and do acceptable work toward the progress of the degree and have 35 per-



cent of their progress for the degree at an institution. We do not wish to penalize those students who transfer to a certifying institution.

[Part A of Proposal No. 23-2 (Page A-83) was adopted by Division I-A, 68-46-1; it was defeated by Division I-AA, 61-62-2. Part B was adopted, 176-135-6.]

#### **Two-Year College Transfers—Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier— Division I**

**Jerry L. Kingston** (Arizona State University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move Proposal 23-1-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intention of this legislation is to provide some type of fail-safe option as was explained by the previous speakers for two-year college students who have taken an adequate level of preparation before they came into the Division I school. This only applies to Division I-AA since I-A has adopted the 35-percent rule. The Council would support the existence of some type of fail-safe measure so that not all students, and particularly those who are well prepared, would not have to put in an academic year of residence in a Division I-AA school.

**Constance H. Hurlbut** (Patriot League): I voted on the prevailing side of Proposal 23-2-A. I would move to reconsider for Division I-AA only, if possible.

[The motion was seconded.]

**William H. Harris** (Alabama State University): I rise to ask my colleagues in Division I-AA not to let this opportunity pass to keep equity with Division I-A. We have just voted by our actions to make our own transfer standards of junior college and community college students more stringent. In fact, it would be shooting us in the foot. I ask them to reconsider this and vote in favor of this amendment.

[The motion to reconsider was approved 114-12-1.]

[Part A of Proposal No. 23-2 (Page A-83) was adopted upon reconsideration by Division I-AA, 114-12-1.]

[Part B of Proposal No. 23-2 (Page A-83) was adopted, 176-135-6.]

#### **Two-Year College Transfers—Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier— Division I**

**Dennis Farrell** (Big West Conference): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I now move the adoption of Proposal No. 24-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 24-1, while maintaining an overall cap of 18 semester or 27 quarter hours of transferrable credit that may be earned during the summer terms for two-year college transfers who are not qualifiers, allows not more than nine semester or 13.5 quarter hours to be earned during the summer immediately prior to transfer.

The NCAA Two-Year College Relations Committee and the Academic Requirements Committee have seen numerous examples of student-athletes completing a significant number of credit hours during summer school at a two-year college, especially during the summer

immediately prior to transfer. While still limiting summer hours immediately prior to the transfer, this proposal attempts to strike the appropriate balance that still affords student-athletes the opportunity to complete meaningful course work that may be necessary for acceptance to a college. With an overall limit of nine semester or 13.5 quarter hours, significant abuses will not likely occur.

**David Quinn** (Baylor University): I will honor your request for brevity. We strongly support this proposal. There is something fundamentally flawed with the system whereby a youngster can attend a junior college for two years, move into a sister state where they have no exit examination and incredibly in 54 days come up with 22 credit hours. We strongly support this measure. As Dr. Kramer said earlier, this is one of the problems we have and it needs to be corrected. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 24-1 (Page A-85) was adopted, 262-54-1.]

**Claudius Watts** (The Citadel): On behalf of the Council and the Academic Requirements Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 24-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a proposal distributed to all of the participants earlier today and yesterday. It will delay the effective date of Proposal No. 24 for one year to give the current two-year college students adequate time to prepare for implementation of Proposal No. 24. If this is not adopted, it is possible that some of our students who intend to graduate from junior college this year will be caught short without enough prior notice. It simply extends the one year of the implementation of that proposal.

[Proposal No. 24-2 (Page A-86) was adopted, 251-62-3.]

**Thomas W. Adair III** (Texas A&M University, College Station): I would like to speak on behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee. The Academic Requirements Committee supports No. 24. We believe this is necessary to ensure that the student-athletes do not obtain successive number of summer hours to meet the requirements to transfer to a four-year institution. Thank you.

**Dennis A. Farrell** (Big West Conference): Like my colleague on the Academic Requirements Committee, the Two-Year College Relations Committee as well as the ARC have seen examples of students completing more than 30 hours during the summer school immediately prior to transfer. In many cases, those student-athletes were not able to complete a similar number of transferrable units during their first two full academic years at the two-year college. This kind of activity certainly brings into question the credibility of the student-athlete's work during summer school. The overall cap of 18 semester or 27 quarter hours will continue to permit students to complete legitimate summer school hours without misusing the other transfer regulations that are currently in place. I urge your support of Proposal No. 24.

[Proposal No. 24 (Page A-84) was adopted as amended by Nos. 24-1 and 24-2, 300-20.]

#### **Two-Year College Transfer—Correspondence Courses**

**Prentice Gautt** (Big Eight Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 27.



[Part B of Proposal No. 7-9 (Page A-44) was adopted, 307-12-2.]

**Constance H. Hurlbut** (Patriot League): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposals 7-10-A, 7-10-B and 7-10-C.

[The motion was seconded.]

A fully informed membership is critical to the success of its representative system of governance and for conference representatives who rely on their conference memberships to provide timely feedback on legislative issues. This communication can occur only if the membership is notified regarding the specifics and details of the legislative issues. This is particularly relevant in Divisions I-AA and I-AAA, where conferences are not automatically represented on the Division I governing body and will rely on interconference communication.

In this regard, this amendment establishes the notification requirement following subcommittee, committee or cabinet action concerning Division I legislation. Therefore, the membership will be informed about legislative developments earlier in the Division I legislative process. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support for Proposal No. 7-10.

[Proposal No. 7-10 (Page A-46) was adopted, 323-0-1.]

**Richard J. Ensor** (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal 7-12.

[The motion was seconded.]

Conferences are permitted to submit legislative proposals and amendments on behalf of their member institutions. Amendment No. 7-12 merely sets forth the process whereby conferences may continue to act on behalf of their institutions in the restructured Division I legislative process.

Under the new system, the membership may file requests to override a Division I legislative action. This amendment will permit conferences to initiate such action on behalf of their schools. To guarantee that the conference has the authority to take such action, this amendment requires that a conference annually submit to the Board of Directors a report that sets forth the conference procedures that assure that the CEOs of member institutions have delegated this authority. The Council believes that in a conference-based governance structure, conferences must have the authority to act on behalf of their schools. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support for Proposal 7-12.

[Proposal No. 7-12 (Page A-48) was adopted, 320-3.]

**Mr. Ensor:** On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal 7-13.

[The motion was seconded.]

One of the features in the proposed representative system of governance is a process wherein Division I institutions can call for a vote to override a legislative decision. If the school disagrees with such a decision, and it has voting privileges, it may file a written request to override the decision with the NCAA national office within 60 days after the publication of the decision. When 30 such requests are filed, the membership proposal will be scheduled to consider to override the action.

This amendment takes the process one step further. Amendment 7-13 establishes a process that suspends the legislation decision from

taking effect until final action on this decision is reached. For example, the override vote is taken. For this suspension to occur, this amendment requires 100 override votes to be filed with the national office within the designated time. The Council believes that such overwhelming concern regarding a legislative decision as demonstrated by at least a filing of 100 requests, justifies the suspension of the Division I legislative decision until the issue is resolved further. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support for amendment No. 7-13.

[Proposal No. 7-13 (Page A-48) was adopted, 311-12.]

**Kenneth Shaw** (Syracuse University): On behalf of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the Council, I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 7-GG, as amended. We believe that this new system is simpler to understand and provides greater opportunities for individuals to serve and is more flexible to answer the changing conditions in intercollegiate athletics, even though the task force developed a governance system that will react, we hope, efficiently and immediately to changing conditions. The notice requirements set forth in the new Division I legislative process will ensure that your representatives will make informed and responsible decisions.

As a result of the notice requirements, institutions will be able to effectively communicate with representatives regarding the Division I issues. After months of compromise and accommodations, the task force believes that it has developed a legislative process that benefits all three subdivisions. Division I-A has received the representation it has sought, and Divisions I-AA and I-AAA have received the financial guarantees and legislative assurances that they need to protect their interests. On behalf of the Commission and the Council, I urge your support for Proposal No. 7-GG.

[Part GG of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) was adopted as amended by Nos. 7-9-B, 7-10, 7-12 and 7-13, 316-3.]

#### **Resolution: NCAA Membership Restructuring**

**Jane Betts** (National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators): On behalf of the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators and its sponsors, I move Resolution No. 9.

[The motion was seconded.]

Many actions have been taken to demonstrate the Association's ongoing commitment to diversity. The Division I Board of Directors has been charged with assuring that there is gender and ethnic diversity throughout the new structure.

The membership opened the business session by overwhelmingly adopting the constitutional principles of diversity. We further confirmed our commitment to diversity by adopting Proposal 7-5 just moments ago. This resolution asks the membership to take one more important step to ensure that the diversity goals stated so eloquently are achieved. That step is to direct the restructuring transition team to develop a specific written plan. Development of such a plan is essential in order to clarify the responsibilities, accountability and process for achieving diversity. Although this proposal contains some language specific to gender representation, the sponsors want to state unequivocally that the resolution's intent is to encompass all aspects of diversity.



ty—race, ethnicity and gender.

This proposal does not prescribe any quotas, it does not prescribe development of any legislation. What passage of this resolution would do is give added assurance that the issue of diversity will be addressed meaningfully and comprehensively during the transition. We urge your support.

**Charles Whitcomb** (San Jose State University): As chair of the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, we would like to speak in support of the issue. We feel that it definitely has a part as we go into the new transitional period. We strongly support asking the transitional team to develop a written plan that is consistent with what we ask our institutions that are going through certification. Thank you.

**Judith Albino** (NCAA Presidents Commission): I would like to note for the Convention that the Presidents Commission did vote to endorse and support Resolution No. 9. As many of you know, as we worked through the plan for restructuring and looked at the possibilities for diversity of representation on the various governing groups, there were problems that were not completely worked through. While there has been language in other proposals, it was clear to all of us that we were not able to fully satisfy all of the needs for ensuring diversity. Those of us who worked on the various task groups, as well as those who were on the Commission to consider this at length, feel strongly that it is desirable to commit to the development of a full plan for ensuring diversity of representation.

We want to echo the thoughts that this diversity should reflect not only diversity of gender but also ethnicity in the same respect that we see diversity across the NCAA. We support and endorse this and urge your support as well.

**Edward B. Fort** (North Carolina A&T State University): I am prepared to endorse the position taken a moment ago by President Albino and before her by the representative speaking for the female administrators in sports administration.

The key, as we see it with respect to No. 9, is (a) a plan, and (b) goals. We are not suggesting that those goals be defined on the floor today. The hope is, that as a part of the deliberations of the transition team, that steps will be taken to actualize their interpretive analysis of precisely what the goals represent and to incorporate the remarks by President Albino that this is all-inclusive so that it identifies the considerations related to gender as well as ethnicity. We urge your support of Resolution No. 9.

**Bridget Niland** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/State University of New York at Buffalo): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee also supports Resolution No. 9. It is important to all members of our committee that the principle of diversity—both gender and ethnicity—be incorporated in the restructuring process.

In addition, we feel that the experience and the student-athletes' voice should be heard as part of that diversity. Proposal No. 9 is a resolution that the Association will strive to achieve diversity of individuals who are on our playing fields to also appear in the board room as well. The committee understands that reaching diversity among our leadership can be a difficult task due to the disparity of women and

minorities currently serving as university and college presidents. However, there is no reason why diversity cannot still be resolved and reached in structuring the Management Council. The administrators and student-athletes of this Association are men and women representing a wide variety of ethnic backgrounds who are committed to academic and athletics excellence. This diversity of individuals working toward the common goal is the Association's greatest asset. Every effort should be made by the leadership to encourage, ensure and protect this diversity at all levels of the NCAA. Based on this reason, we urge your support of Proposal No. 9.

**Thomas C. Hansen** (Pacific-10 Conference): I'm a member of the Division I task force. As we prepare to leave the subject of restructuring in our division, I would like the chair to indulge me for just one moment, not to address No. 9, but comment to you on the work of the chair of the task force, Chancellor Bud Shaw of Syracuse University, who led us through a task that at times, particularly initially, I didn't think we would ever achieve what we have achieved.

I commend Chancellor Shaw's brilliant leadership of our group, not only within the division itself, but in selling the division's program and suggestions to the other divisions and the new federated ability to control our own destiny in Division I. I ask you to join in a round of applause for Chancellor Shaw. (Applause)

**Mr. Sweazy:** Thank you, Tom, and thank you, Chancellor Shaw. You are both going to be very embarrassed if No. 9 doesn't pass.

[Resolution No. 9 (Page A-50) was adopted, 314-14-3.]

#### **Resolution: Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct**

**William W. Sutton** (Mississippi Valley State University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 12 on behalf of the Council, the Presidents Commission and the Presidents Commission's Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics.

[The motion was seconded.]

This resolution calls for the development of legislation to be considered at the 1997 NCAA Convention that would include sportsmanship and ethical conduct as a specific component of the athletics certification process.

It was the sense of the committee submitting this resolution that true athletics competition and educational value for individuals cannot exist unless they are rounded in sportsmanship and ethical conduct. Ethical conduct by everyone associated with intercollegiate athletics—its students, coaches, officials, administrators, faculty and observers—must be emphasized if intercollegiate athletics is to serve as the proper role in higher education. We recommend the support of this proposal.

[Resolution No. 12 (Page A-52) was adopted, 312-5.]

#### **Partial Qualifier—Division I**

**William E. Kirwan** (University of Maryland, College Park): I would like to move Proposal No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

Let me say at the outset that I believe strongly in the academic reforms that the previous Conventions have passed. I would never advo-

*Division I Business Session*



cate anything that I felt was retreating in any way from the reforms.

This proposal is not a retreat. It corrects an unfortunate omission in the definition of a partial qualifier that was enacted last year. Simply put, Proposal No. 19 expands the definition of a partial qualifier to include student-athletes who meet the standards of Proposition No. 48. Specifically, it would include as partial qualifiers students who have an SAT of 700 or higher, and who have a GPA between 2.00 and 2.50 in 13 core courses. That is it. That is all it does. If we do not pass this proposal, then starting this coming fall we will be in the anomalous position of allowing a group of students who have not met the standards set in Proposition No. 48 to be partial qualifiers and thereby receive athletically based financial aid. At the same time, we will be saying to a group of students who up through this fall would be full qualifiers, not only are you not a full qualifier, you are not even a partial qualifier. Therefore, you can't receive athletically related aid.

How can we say that to students who understood the standards we set in Proposition No. 48 and successfully met those standards? The Presidents Commission voted to change its position on this proposal from opposition to neutrality. I strongly urge passage of Proposal No. 19.

**Milton A. Gordon** (California State University, Fullerton): I want to add to what was just said about Proposal No. 19. When we took action last year, the result was the gap as was just indicated. Students who were fully qualified previously would now be in the "nonqualified" status.

Proposal No. 19 would correct this and would at least allow them to be partially qualified and continue to have an opportunity to be successful in our universities.

**Jerry Kingston** (Arizona State University): On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I request that the delegates defeat Proposal No. 19. In contrast to the views of the previous speakers, I believe indeed that the passage of Proposal No. 19 would be a retreat away from the reform movement.

I believe that academic reform is indeed at the heart of our reform movement. It is the case that if every student who currently is eligible for athletically related aid and practices as a freshman under our current standards, continues to be eligible for athletically related practice as a freshman after our new standards go into effect. That impact of five years' worth of work in academic reform would add a group of students, between 600 and 690 on the SAT, and will have been to increase the number of core courses from 11 to 13.

I believe, because I have heard a lot of the discussion over the last several days, that there are conferences and others that are reporting statistics that student-athletes who are eligible under Prop 48 and would not be eligible under Prop 16 are graduating at rates that are certainly not as high as those who are on or above the index. But they are still reasonably high or close enough to those standards where people wish to continue to allow them to receive athletically related aid and practice as a freshman. I think we also need to understand, though, that a consequence of being a partial qualifier is three years of eligibility for athletics competition. When the students who are about

to be impacted by No. 19 continue to be recruited and come into our institutions, they have three years of competition.

They will certainly sit out their freshman year. They will use their three seasons of competition, and then at the time that we are certifying them for their final season of competition, the beginning of their fourth year, they will only have to be half done with their degrees. In fact, many of them, I believe, will not have proceeded far enough along toward their degree to be able to qualify for the fifth year of athletically related aid. So, in fact, I believe that if we pass Proposal 19, we will have lost the heart of what we have been about over a long period of time. I urge the delegates to defeat Proposal No. 19.

**Alex Wood** (Black Coaches Association): I would like to speak in support of Proposal No. 19. It is our belief that Proposal No. 19 promotes greater access in higher education for African-American student-athletes. Under our previous legislation, those same student-athletes would have been qualifiers.

The BCA endorses many proposals that increase educational opportunities for African-Americans. Proposal No. 19 will expand the definition of partial qualifiers and, therefore, become much more inclusive legislation as it relates to African-American student-athletes. The BCA has also promoted higher academic standards that show reasonable consideration for African-American student-athletes who are considered socio-economically disadvantaged and at risk. The proposal does not lower these standards. It rather provides access to those students who are considered qualifiers under the current standard. In all due respect to Mr. Kingston's analysis, those are projections of what students might do. But if we vote this down, there will be no projections.

We feel strongly at the BCA that we need to support and this body needs to support legislation against that which promotes access to higher education for minority student-athletes. This opportunity will be lost for many if we vote this down. We urge the delegates to support Proposal No. 19.

**Robert W. Lawless** (Texas Tech University): I speak in support of Proposal No. 19. If we look at the legislation that was enacted in Proposal 16, you will find that we changed, as has been noted, and picked up a series of student-athletes scoring as low as 600 on the SAT.

At the same time, this move takes, as has already been mentioned, people scoring between 700 and 900 and between 2.00 and 2.50 on the grade-point average who were previously under Proposition 48 full qualifiers and now makes them nonqualifiers. I think that it is consistent with the reform and advancement if in changing the characteristics of those students who we do change to at least partial-qualifier status. That is, an individual who previously would have had a grade point of 2.000 and could have scored 880 on the SAT and be a full qualifier would now be deemed a nonqualifier while we would be accepting someone with an SAT score as low as 600 as a partial qualifier.

With all the controversy over standardized tests, they are at least consistent. We have much more variation in high-school grade-point averages from one school to another. Therefore, I think that it is in the best interest of the NCAA and in the best interest of the respective



[The motion was seconded.]

The Academic Requirements Committee and the Two-Year College Relations Committee developed this proposal as a part of a legislative package in response to the request to strengthen our two-year college transfer rules.

It has come to the attention of the Academic Requirements Committee, however, that some serious problems may exist related to this proposal. In particular, the National Association of Registrars, has stated that there is no uniform, consistent method in place to identify correspondence courses on two-year college transcripts. In addition, there is concern that this proposal may unintentionally limit the future use of legitimate satellite or internet course work. Moreover, it is anticipated that such "distance" learning may grow considerably in the near future.

Therefore, on behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I move that Proposal No. 27 be referred back to the Academic Requirements Committee and the Two-Year College Relations Committee for further study with both committees charged with reporting their recommendations to the Council and the Commission regarding this issue by August 1, 1996.

[The motion to refer was seconded.]

**David Guinn** (Baylor University): I really wish this would not be referred. I wish we would vote on it. Of all the problems we confront in regard to the two-year college transfers, this is probably the most serious. We discussed this yesterday in the legislative forum.

I know there are problems in identifying the correspondence courses on transcripts and problems in finding where some of the correspondence courses were taken. This is not a problem confined to one or two institutions. In the rationale, it makes reference to the United States versus Johnson. The number of NCAA institutions involved is about 40 and it is up now to 70. The number of students involved is in the hundreds. If it is going to be referred, I hope that in short order something will be brought back that will reflect the number of correspondence courses that one can take in that regard.

As with last year when Proposal 66 was referred back to Dr. Kingston, we would like to have the opportunity to have some input with him in that regard. We have had a little experience with it. Thank you.

**Rev. David T. Tyson** (University of Portland): I am a member of the Presidents Commission. The Presidents Commission does support the Council's motion to refer Proposal No. 27 to the Academic Requirements Committee and to the Two-Year College Relations Committee.

The Commission does recognize the definitional administrative difficulties that are present with the issue of correspondence courses. At the same time, the Commission recognizes the seriousness of the instances that have occurred in this regard. The Commission considers this an urgent matter and strongly urges the committees to address the difficulties of administration regarding the identification of correspondence courses on transcripts as well as the definitional concerns that have been identified in a timely fashion for the purposes of future legislation. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 27 (Page A-89) was referred to the Academic Requirements and Two-Year College Relations Committees, 257-57.]

**Mr. Sweazy:** We will reconvene for the general business session at 4 p.m. We are recessed at this time until tomorrow morning.

[The Division I business session was recessed at 3:30 p.m.]

## Tuesday Morning, January 9, 1996

The Division I business session was called to order at 10 a.m. with Robert Sweazy presiding.

### OPENING REMARKS

**Mr. Sweazy:** We are ready to begin, so please come to order. We are now ready to complete the Division I agenda for this Convention. We will complete our legislative actions, take action on two requests for a waiver of Division I membership criteria, then open the floor for discussion of any other legislation or topics of interest to Division I. Then we will conduct the election of the new Division I Council members and the Division I vice-president.

We begin our legislative deliberations as listed on pages 247 to 250 of the Official Convention Notice. Does somebody care to move Proposal No. 43?

### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

#### De Minimis Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes

**Robert J. Baugh** (Eastern Kentucky University): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 43, items C through J.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to eliminate the ineligibility component from current legislation that affects the prospect's or student-athlete's eligibility when a representative of an institution violates legislation that does not result in a benefit being provided to the prospect or student-athlete. An institution seldom gains a recruiting advantage in these types of violations. It is important to note that all violations of NCAA rules, including those that affect this proposal, must continue to be reported to the NCAA.

One or more of the penalties outlined in Bylaw 19.6.1 will continue to be imposed on institutions and institutional employees. The only difference is that we will not affect the eligibility of innocent student-athletes. You will notice there is a correction to letter "J" of this proposal. A modification of this legislation should indicate that if a prospect's official visit extends beyond the 48-hour limit due to inclement weather, the violation does not affect the prospect's eligibility. The Eligibility Committee believes the proposal is effective and takes positive steps for deregulation of the de minimis violations that currently affect a prospect's or student-athletes' eligibility. The committee strongly urges your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 43 (Page A-122) was adopted.]

#### Expenses—Travel to Regular-Season Contests During Vacation Period—Divisions I and II

**Mary Jo Warner** (George Washington University): On behalf of the



Division I Steering Committee and the Council, I move Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal addresses the expenses related to travel to regular-season contests during the vacation period. Under current legislation, the student-athlete is required to pay the equivalence of a round-trip ticket to his or her home when traveling home on vacation in conjunction with away-from-home contests, even if the team stops in the student-athlete's home city at no additional cost to the institution.

The current rule, in effect, can require students to subsidize team travel if they remain home following an event. Proposal No. 49 would allow an institution to provide the cost of round-trip transportation for the student-athlete's travel from campus to the event site and back to the campus, even if the student-athlete did not travel with the team. If the student-athlete traveled to a site other than the event site during the vacation period, the student-athlete would pay only the additional costs associated with traveling to that site. I urge your support of Proposal No. 49.

[Proposal No. 49 (Page A-131) was adopted.]

#### **Recognition by Professional Sports Organization**

**Larry R. Gerlach** (University of Utah): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

Professional sports organizations wish to honor student-athletes and teams in various ways to recognize extraordinary achievement, such as national championships or Olympic Games participation. The NCAA Professional Sports Liaison Committee believes this proposal, which would allow student-athletes to accept complimentary admissions to professional sports contests as well as be honored for such an achievement, provides an experience that should transcend the application of NCAA regulations.

The committee also believes that it is the institution's responsibility to determine the nature of an extraordinary achievement, but this regulation would not allow a student-athlete or team to be honored on a regular basis by a professional sports organization. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 50.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-132) was adopted.]

#### **Promotional Activities**

**E. James McCloskey** (University of Florida): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 133.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is the result of the Legislative Review Committee's review of Bylaw 16 that identified areas in which the rules could be deregulated and identified the effects on NCAA eligibility when a student-athlete who wins a prize in an activity that utilizes athletics abilities in such an area.

In the committee's opinion, the student-athlete who is selected at random to participate in the contest in which athletics ability is used to win a prize should not become ineligible if she or he wins. Accord-

ingly, the committee recommends that the Council support this legislation. In order to not affect eligibility, the contest must be open to the general public or the student body in general. As noted in the rationale, institutions should be trusted not to "set up" such contests as a means for providing benefits to student-athletes. I urge you to join the Council in supporting this legislation.

[Proposal No. 133 (Page A-251) was adopted.]

#### **Financial Aid—Equivalency Figure for Books**

**R. Elaine Dreidame** (University of Dayton): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of this proposal would increase from \$200 to \$400 the equivalency value utilized for books in determining compliance with institutional financial aid limitations for each sport. The committee submits this proposal to the membership as a result of its findings while doing the need-based case study.

The committee noted during its financial aid survey of Division I and Division II institutions that the current \$200 figure is in no way indicative or reflective of the actual dollars expended for books and should be revised to better reflect the true cost. The committee is aware that the equivalency figure for a particular student-athlete may be affected by such an adjustment, but the result should be inconsequential across an entire sports team. The Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism urge the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

[Proposal No. 52 (Page A-134) was adopted.]

#### **Financial Aid—Division I Women's Sports**

**Charlotte West** (Southern Illinois University at Carbondale): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 54.

[The motion was seconded.]

I think most of you will remember several years ago the Gender-Equity Task Force recommended increases in select sports scholarships for women. The Council referred the idea of increases to the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism. This is the committee's result of the two-year study of NCAA grant limitations. During the course of that study, the committee received input from various coaches associations, sports committees and athletics associations regarding principles that should be used in setting grant limits in every sport.

The proposal before you seeks to amend the grant limit in women's sports only. The Council and the committee believe that in these sports current NCAA grant limitations were the most inconsistent with the various principles agreed to by the committee, including squad size, entry rates, number of participants, gender equity and number of sponsoring schools. Conversely, the committee agreed that certain emerging sports for women originally had been given grant limits that were too high to encourage sponsorship of those sports. This proposal seeks to reduce those limits to a more appropriate level. You may also note that the increases and decreases result in no overall increase. Ad-



ditionally, the proposal clarifies the institutional sport limitation for an institution that sponsors cross country, but does not sponsor indoor/outdoor track and field.

The Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism urge the adoption of Proposal No. 54.

**James M. O'Fallon** (University of Oregon): I move for consideration of Parts A, B and C separately.

[The motion was seconded and defeated.]

**Meg Stephenson** (National Association of Collegiate Gymnastics Coaches for Women): We are unanimously in favor of Proposal No. 54-A, which would increase the number of scholarships for women's gymnastics from 10 to 12. At the collegiate level, we have changed the rules for women's gymnastics to allow for more participation. Because of that, we need more scholarships so that we may field full teams and adequately rest our athletes during the season, which would help to reduce our injury rate. The coaches association strongly urges you to support Proposal No. 54-A. Thank you.

**Cheryl L. Levick** (Stanford University): I, too, rise in support of Proposal No. 54. You have just heard from the collegiate gymnastics coaches association. The NCAA Division I Women's Gymnastics Committee also supports it. This is one of the great times when we both believe in the same thing. Not only does it help the athlete, you know that, not only does it help with the sport's personality, you know that, but for three years, the committee has been trying to go through the system at the Convention to try to correct a scholarship limit that does not match the rules and no longer matches what we need to do in the area of gymnastics.

The result we have seen is an increase in injuries because of the insufficient time for the gymnasts to rest. The Council and this body have now corrected an administrative error. We strongly urge your support of this proposal.

**Joe Dean** (Louisiana State University): I speak in favor of Proposal No. 54. At a time when many of us are struggling to reach out for numbers for gender-equity reasons, these additional scholarships will help not only in the area of scholarships, but add in participation numbers. Please vote in favor of No. 54.

[Proposal No. 54 (Page A-136) was adopted.]

#### **Eligibility for Practice—Minimum Full-Time Enrollment—**

#### **United States Olympic Committee/ National Governing Body Waiver**

**DeLores S. Todd** (Atlantic Coast Conference): On behalf of the Council and the Olympics Sports Liaison Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

As a member of the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I ask for your full support of Proposal No. 56. Because of its tremendous importance in strengthening this relationship between the NCAA and the United States Olympic Committee, this proposal was formulated by the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee at the request of the USOC and a special NCAA task force.

That task force was cochaired by USOC Vice-President George Steinbrenner, who expressed serious concerns about NCAA regula-

tions that concern Olympic athletes about using an institution's athletics facilities. One of the findings of the task force was that the USOC should not continue to build new training centers when first-class facilities exist at our colleges and universities.

A limited exception that will be created by Proposal No. 56, which is intended primarily for former student-athletes who have completed their collegiate eligibility, would help to match resources with USOC needs. The task force views this proposal as very significant since the USOC in return is considering the provision of financial assistance to NCAA institutions in all three divisions to assist with the support of major as well as emerging sports. The Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee strongly support this proposal. I urge your support as well.

**Mr. Sweazy:** Thank you. Before we vote on the proposal, we will vote on the effective date, which is immediate. It takes a two-thirds vote.

[The immediate effective date was approved.]

**Mr. Sweazy:** We are now ready to vote on Proposal No. 56, with an immediate effective date.

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-138) was adopted.]

#### **Eligibility—Seasons of Competition—Tennis**

**Thomas A. Kazee** (Davidson College): I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Jeff Frank** (Intercollegiate Tennis Association): Speaking on behalf of the Intercollegiate Tennis Association, Proposal No. 57 is a unique proposal in that the coaches are not asking for concessions, but seeking to further restrict ourselves. We're requesting your help in helping us address abuses so that we can ensure general academic integrity, a more level playing field and reinforce the concept of amateurism.

Because of some misunderstandings, please note that Proposal No. 57 does not discriminate against international students. In fact, it applies also to American student-athletes, and it does not affect the available scholarships. Basically, No. 57 allows players a one-year grace period upon graduation from high school. If they enter college within that one-year grace period, they are immediately eligible and have four years of eligibility. If they enter after this one-year grace period, for every year that they play organized tennis on the professional circuit, they would lose one year of eligibility. When they reenter they would have to sit out for a year.

There are abuses. To give you some illustrations what this would address, currently, players can play all over the world for three, four and five years and then play intercollegiate tennis. A mid-20-year-old off the pro tour may be playing against 18-year-olds in matches. Secondly, because there are not many tournaments starting after the first of the year, players often drop off the tour for a semester, enter a school, register but not attend classes, play through the conference tournament or NCAA tournament, and then drop out of school.

We would not presume to judge whether other sports need this proposal, but it is needed in Division I tennis. It is consistent with the move to a more federated approach as an Association. We have dis-



cussed these problems for over five years. We have polled our membership and over 70 percent of the Division I coaches have endorsed this proposal. If passed, Proposal No. 57 would create a more level playing field for student-athletes of comparable ages. It would solve the current amateurism problems, since investigation and confirmation of player's status, particularly of international players, are so difficult for the NCAA.

It would emphasize that intercollegiate athletics include academics and that the entering student-athletes should be committed to a legitimate educational process. Thank you.

**Richard Haitbrink** (United States Tennis Association): The USTA is the national governing body of the sport of tennis. The USTA strongly supports and encourages the young men and women who have participated in USTA junior tennis programs to take advantage of the college educational experience without undue delay, rather than to drift along for a period of one or two years building their tennis skills on a professional tennis circuit before deciding to enter college.

The USTA is concerned about college tennis and about the thousands of junior tennis players in the United States who are looking forward to a college educational experience. The current eligibility requirements permit the continuing existence of certain inequities in tennis, a primary one being that in many instances college tennis players are faced with competing against men and women—both in the United States and other countries—who are several years older and who have been competing on professional tennis circuits all over the world for a period of one to six years before they enter college. Proposal No. 57 would eliminate this inequity. It would, in effect, level the playing field. It would create a fair, competitive opportunity for all college tennis players, including those thousands of young men and women who have grown up in the USTA tennis system and wish to participate in the college educational and tennis experience.

The adoption of Proposal No. 57 would also greatly diminish the difficulty we have in monitoring the abuse of amateur status as we know it in the United States and under current USTA and NCAA rules. There is no way currently to adequately monitor the payment of funds, either as expense money or as prize money, to tennis players, including American players who compete in professional tournaments outside the United States. The practical effect of adopting Proposal No. 57 will be to minimize the effect of abuses that do occur in this area.

In closing, let me say that the president and CEO of the USTA, Lester M. Snyder Jr., who is a faculty member at an NCAA Division I member institution and on the board of directors of the USTA, strongly supports the adoption of Proposal No. 57 and has communicated this support to the presidents, the faculty athletics representatives and the athletics directors of all NCAA member institutions.

**Joseph W. Helmick** (Texas Christian University): I would simply quickly reinforce the notion that in addition to solving what is a serious problem, this has happy advantages of advocating the best value of both amateurism and academic integrity. It specifically refers to the eligibility standards we have been promoting in the Association. I urge your adoption of No. 57.

[Proposal No. 57 (Page A-140) was adopted.]

#### **Participation After 21st Birthday**

**John C. Parry** (Butler University): On behalf of all of the members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

Last year, this Convention overwhelmingly adopted a clear definition of the "21-year-age rule." It was a good change. However, the effective date was for those who enrolled August 1, 1995. This proposal would change the effective date to those who enrolled August 1, 1992, thereby allowing us a better definition to be applied to three classes that have already enrolled student-athletes. This proposal helps students. I urge your support. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 58 (Page A-141) was adopted.]

#### **Core-Curriculum Requirements—Eighth-Grade Courses**

**Cliff Gillespie** (Middle Tennessee State University): On behalf of the Council and the Academic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 60.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation permits the use of an eighth-grade course to meet core-curriculum requirements, provided the eighth-grade course is considered by the high school to be equivalent to one of the high school's core courses. That provision was adopted prior to the establishment of the Council Subcommittee on Initial-Eligibility Waivers. As we know, some times high schools do not fully understand how our core requirements and definitions apply to their own courses, let alone eighth-grade course work.

The legislation is fairly straightforward when you are dealing with a course like Algebra I, but it is much more complicated with other eighth-grade courses. The Academic Requirements Committee and the Council believe that the waiver committee and its staff should review these individual cases to be sure that the eighth-grade course in question does, in fact, meet the NCAA core-course requirements. If the course is found to be the equivalent of an accepted core course at the high school, then the course can be added to the clearinghouse file and approved for subsequent students who attend that high school and take that eighth-grade course.

Our committee urges you to adopt Proposal No. 60. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 60 (Page A-143) was adopted.]

#### **Participation Prior to Initial-Eligibility Certification— Nonrecruited Student-Athletes—Women's Crew**

**Mary Jo Warner** (George Washington University): On behalf of the Council, I move Proposal No. 61.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would extend the temporary initial-eligibility certification period for student-athletes participating in women's crew by permitting nonrecruited students to practice, but not compete throughout the nontraditional season in that sport.

Women's crew generally does not enjoy the same participation on the high-school level as that found in other sports. Many crew partici-



pants at the college level have no crew background and in some cases have no experience in any sport. Many of the members are walk-ons who are recruited on campus after initial enrollment. It takes an inordinate amount of time to teach the basic fundamentals to those prospects. It is therefore necessary and important to allow as much time as possible to expose students to the sport and to encourage their continued participation.

The Council believes that it is important to support this extension to the temporary initial-eligibility certification period. Thank you.

**Cliff Gillespie** (Middle Tennessee State University): On behalf of the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee, we speak in opposition to Proposal No. 61.

This survey should not be considered an indictment by our committee against women's crew. We are encouraged by the prospect that there will be increased opportunities for women. We anticipate that in time women's crew will be recognized as an established sport.

Our concern is as follows: Number one, we are concerned that this proposal might permit student-athletes who do not meet our initial-eligibility standards to participate. The purpose of our initial-eligibility standards are in large part to help identify those students who may have difficulty during their initial year of enrollment. Isn't this goal valid for women's crew participants as well? Number two, we have a current rule that permits these nonrecruits to practice for 45 days. We believe this is sufficient. Extending the 45-day period for the students' initial eligibility will be helpful in keeping more students interested in women's crew. Third, we don't believe it is appropriate to single out specific sports and exempt them from our initial-eligibility standards. We find strength in the fact that our standards apply to all. Moreover, what do we tell our sports that may believe they do not share in the widespread support similar to women's crew? The Academic Requirements Committee urges you to oppose Proposal No. 61.

**Clayton W. Chapman** (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Division I members who have cosponsored this proposal with the NCAA Council, I want to emphasize to the Convention the importance of its adoption today.

I can appreciate the Academic Requirements Committee objecting to any special consideration for a sport, specifically an exception to the certification period. I believe there is valid justification for the extension in this instance for women's crew. It is an emerging sport that relies so heavily on nonrecruited walk-on students, 90 percent of whom have never been exposed to the sport. It takes the entire fall season—approximately eight to nine weeks—to teach these novices, who may number in excess of 100 students, just to match the basic fundamentals of the sport. It requires them to register with the clearinghouse within the current limit of 45 days. It would deter some of them from continuing with the sport simply because of the \$18 fee.

In addition, the mere effort by institutional compliance officers to certify these walk-ons is burdensome at a time when certification for all fall-sports athletes is the priority. Therefore, deferring the temporary initial-eligibility certification period for these students participating in the sport of women's crew by permitting a nonrecruited student

to practice, but not to compete until the end of the fall season, as is currently done at virtually all Division I rowing schools, will not compromise the other sports. It will be a tremendous benefit for their staying with the crew program and thereby enhance the growth of women's rowing as an emerging sport. I urge the Convention to adopt Proposal No. 61. Thank you.

**Carolyn Campbell** (The Ivy Group): I just wanted to clarify that this proposal is not about whether or not rowers should meet the same eligibility standards as other athletes do. These are students who were not recruited as athletes and whose admission was not based on athletics ability. Therefore, they are very likely to be qualifiers.

It is merely a question of practicality in what would be a bureaucratic barrier to a student trying the sport. Women's crew teams consist of student-athletes who have never seen the sport before arriving at a college campus. It takes approximately three months for them to learn the score as a novice. Then they are in a position to decide whether to pursue a spot on the team. It is at that point that a rower should be required to pay the fee to the clearinghouse to certify initial eligibility. Please support this emerging sport and our attempt to increase the number of women athletes in our programs.

**Pauline N. Saternow** (Youngstown State University): Would these same students be listed on the squad list form and be counted as participants in trying to reach the equivalencies for counting student-athletes? If so, it would seem inappropriate that we would extend this time period for them to be certified if they are counting them on one hand and not counting them on the other.

**Jeffrey H. Orleans** (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors and the Council, I don't know that we have actually considered that question. Specifically, our goal would certainly not be to, if you will, pad the participation numbers with students who have not yet been certified.

As Carolyn said, the only practical way to give these young women the chance to know whether they want to try to row is to give them the opportunity to learn the sport. I would hope that we would not force them to pay the fee to go through certification simply in order to practice and see whether they want to play. If we do that, most of them are likely to not pay the fee and will walk away from the sport. The goal of our legislation later this morning, which is to have approval of emerging NCAA women's sports, is going to be seriously compromised.

[Proposal No. 61 (Page A-144) was defeated, 138-143-34.]

#### **Satisfactory-Progress—Additional Waivers**

**Chris Monasch** (Northeast Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 64.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will authorize the Academic Requirements Committee to treat all satisfactory-progress waivers that currently are being treated by the Administrative Review Panel.

Adopting this proposal will ensure that those who have known expertise in this area will be reviewing these cases. The adoption of this proposal will streamline the waiver process and ensure that cases are resolved more quickly. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 64.



**Cliff Gillespie** (Middle Tennessee State University): The Academic Requirements Committee urges the adoption of this proposal.  
[Proposal No. 64 (Page A-146) was adopted.]

#### **Graduate Student—One-Time Transfer Exception**

**Kathryn Statz** (Marquette University): I would like to move the adoption of Proposal No. 65.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under current legislation, the student who has not received his or her bachelor's degree may transfer from one institution to another and immediately be eligible to compete if he or she meets the requirements for the one-time transfer exception. However, a student who has received the bachelor's degree prior to exhausting eligibility cannot transfer to a different four-year school and still use the one-time transfer. Instead, the student has to decide between transferring prior to receiving his bachelor's degree or transferring after receiving the degree and receiving remaining eligibility.

The student-athletes who excel academically should not be penalized. A student must often transfer to a different institution in order to enter a particular graduate program. It is not appropriate that he or she should give up their remaining eligibility while the students who have not received a bachelor's degree may transfer.

Concerns have been expressed that this legislation will open up the door to recruiting a four-year prospect. However, the same safeguards that are currently in place for utilizing the one-time transfer will be there under this legislation. Releases will still have to be obtained regarding the transfer and to utilize the one-time transfer exception.

In addition, this exception is still not available in Division I football, men's and women's basketball, ice hockey—the sports where recruiting is most likely to occur. I urge you to pass this legislation in fairness to athletes who complete their degree program and are interested in furthering their education.

**Laura L. Klingseisen** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Guilford College): Our committee supports Proposal No. 65. When a student-athlete finishes his or her undergraduate degree with eligibility still left, that should be considered an accomplishment and they should be rewarded.

To complete one's eligibility and obtain a postgraduate degree seems a logical answer, especially since a student program of choice may not be offered at the undergraduate institution. We all realize the importance of education as well as athletics. Let's allow graduate student-athletes to have a choice of education and athletics. We urge you to support Proposal No. 65. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 65 (Page A-147) was adopted.]

#### **Playing and Practice Seasons—Contest Exemptions—Division I**

**Mary Jo Warner** (George Washington University): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the NCAA Special Committee to Review Contest Exemptions, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 69.

[The motion was seconded.]

**David R. Hart Jr.** (Florida State University): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 69-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation permits the Division I institution to participate in an exempted preseason football game once every four years. This proposal ensures a competitive gate as well as television viewers and in turn will generate revenue for continued distribution for scholarships. The special committee has been charged with oversight review of these contests, which is consistent with other such exempted events. I urge adoption of Proposal No. 69-1.

[Proposal No. 69-1 (Page A-167) was adopted.]

At the 1995 post-Convention Council meeting, the special committee was appointed as an outgrowth of the concern of Division I members regarding the proliferation of exempted contest exemptions. The special committee was charged with reviewing contest exemptions as set forth in Bylaw 17. After much debate and, in fact, having in-person presentations by affected events and constituent groups, the special committee forwarded its recommendation to the Council, which has emanated in Proposal No. 69.

Proposal No. 69 seems rather cumbersome. However, the proposal is as follows: First, in Division I, an exempted event should be certified by the NCAA Special Events Committee. Second, to expand the duties of the Special Events Committee to include the certification of exempted events. Third, to expand the membership of the special committee to include representatives of Divisions I-AA and I-AAA. Fourth, to establish a new schedule for contest exemptions.

This proposal represents the significant increase in the demands of sponsoring organizations of the exempted event, highlighted by the creation of the certification program defined in Section J and included in Bylaw 30, which may be amended by the Council, if necessary.

The new criteria will prohibit parlaying exemptions in a single season by an institution, reduce or eliminate competitive inequities that exist and restore some of the integrity related to limitations on the playing season. The results of the proposal should be a reduction in missed class time and a more rewarding and enjoyable event for the student-athlete. Therefore, I urge your support of adopting Proposal No. 69.

**William L. Cords** (Marquette University): I am a member of the Conference USA. As a representative of this body, I know exactly where we are coming from. I would like to address concerns about Proposal No. 69.

The intent of this proposal is very good and commendable. The application of this particular proposal may be harmful in some areas. We are not rewarding the excellence and quality of our student-athletes and coaches in their efforts. The growth of women's programs has been tremendous over the last several years and will continue. Not all of the very good teams that are in this country in women's basketball and women's volleyball get into the NCAA championships. That is nobody's fault. It is just because there are a large number of teams that may be deserving and there are only a certain number of slots.

If this proposal passes, the national women's invitational tournament, which is a basketball tournament, and the national invitational volleyball tournament will cease to exist and we will lose some oppor-



tunities for our women student-athletes. In men's and women's tennis, there are a number of invitational tournaments in this country and individual student-athletes attend those. How they fare in those tournaments often impacts on the ratings and the rankings for those student-athletes as they get closer to the NCAA championships. This will damage that process.

So, for these reasons, there are concerns about the impact of this proposal. The proposal in its principle is fine. I would hope that at some point that we might look to see if we can refer this until all of the implications of this proposal can be taken into account. For future reference, although I believe Proposal No. 78 is deserving, we need to be very careful about how we handle all of these kinds of events or we wouldn't have the kinds of exceptions that we are talking about in this proposal.

Again, Mr. Chairman and the body, I apologize for my introduction, but I thought the thoughts and clarification were needed.

**Thomas C. Hansen** (Pacific-10 Conference): As chair of the special committee that created the proposals, I think that Bill makes some good points, but I would inform the body that our committee was under considerable pressure to eliminate completely the non-NCAA events.

We feel that the demands upon the non-NCAA postseason events and the others that are to be certified by the Special Events Committee are modest. In fact, in choosing these, we elected Division III NCAA standards as far as squad size and other financial details. So, the Special Events Committee can look at this and can adjust as needed to be sure that we do not unnecessarily or unwittingly eliminate competition. But it is important to have the body know that even when we reported first to the Council in April, the Council felt the committee had not gone far enough in restricting the non-NCAA events.

I would remind the delegates that the size of our NCAA field has been greatly expanded in recent years, and that was a factor that was cited to us by those who urged us to go forward. Thank you.

**Frederick E. Gruninger** (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): I move Proposal No. 69-3.

[The motion was seconded.]

No. 69-3 requires an institution hosting an exempt preseason football event to participate in that event. We think that is important in relationship to the membership's responsibilities as such.

[Proposal No. 69-3 (Page A-168) was adopted.]

**William Byrne** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I move Proposal No. 69-4.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 69-4 would eliminate the restriction that not more than one team in any one Division I conference can participate in a preseason football game. As you all are aware, there has been considerable conference movement over the last few years that has significantly reduced the number of teams that are eligible to participate in preseason games. Remember that these games have provided over \$5 million in postseason football scholarships so far with dollars going to all of our divisions. In fact, this last year, we had our first NAIA scholarship re-

cipient. So, there is significant income for all of our student-athletes. We think it is important. We are trying to do what is best. Thank you.

**Richard J. Ensor** (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I speak in opposition to Proposal No. 69-4. We believe that the issue should be considered by the Special Committee to Review Contest Exemptions and the Special Events Committee to determine how they would deal with the overall contest exemptions. I move to refer this proposal to the committee.

[The motion to refer Proposal 69-4 (Page A-169) to the Special Committee to Review Contest Exemptions was seconded and adopted.]

[Parts A, D, E, F, G, H and J of Proposal No. 69 (Page A-152) were adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 69-1 and 69-3. Parts B and C were adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA as amended by No. 69-1.]

#### **Reconsideration of Participation Prior to Initial-Eligibility Certification—Nonrecruited Student-Athletes—Women's Crew**

**Marcia L. Saneholtz** (Washington State University): Having voted on the prevailing side of Proposal No. 61, I would like to move to have that vote reconsidered.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Robert H. Aronson** (University of Washington): There were a large number of abstentions. I imagine there are people who don't have an approved program or experience with crew, but you have had experience with the initial-eligibility clearinghouse. Just imagine several hundred student-athletes who are not recruited, who didn't know they were going to play in the sport. You had no way of knowing they were going to play in the sport. They show up in the fall, and you have got a time to get them certified at the same time that you are trying to certify all the other fall sports.

It takes more than 45 days. Some of them don't even show up until the end of that period. We are trying to go through the clearinghouse during this period. I appeal to those of you who abstained but have had experience with the initial-eligibility clearinghouse to vote "yes" on this proposal.

**Clayton W. Chapman** (Eastern College Athletic Conference): There are a number of Division I schools today that operate this way. They certify initial eligibility for the end of the fall semester rather than during the 45-day period, which is what they are privileged to do up to now without compromising any other sport. So, I would make that note to the membership and urge your support of this consideration.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 61 was approved.]

**Carolyn Campbell** (Ivy Group): I just want to emphasize that this is the way that crew initial-eligibility has been handled at all the institutions that have been sponsoring crew for several years. We have never found it to be problematic.

In terms of the question asked about equivalencies, we anticipate that the numbers are not calculated on equivalencies for sports-sponsorship purposes until the end of the season. So only those remaining on the squad list at the end of the season in the spring would be count-



ed for those purposes. So these students, who did not participate through the season, the ones who we will be most concerned about, would not be affected by this. We urge your support of this crew-specific proposal and aid the transition to coming under the rubric of the NCAA.

**Carol Iwaoka** (Big Ten Conference): In the event that the walk-on student is not certified by the clearinghouse, we would consider this a de minimis violation.

**Pauline N. Saternow** (Youngstown State University): My question was not concerning counting them for scholarship limits and those sorts of things. But if you are under an OCR review, or some other type of review and trying to count your number of participants, these people would count as having practiced. I feel that if you are going to count them as a member of your team and count them as having practiced, you should be held responsible for the eligibility. I realize that the fall term is very difficult, but 45 days to get kids to register for the clearinghouse and to possibly be cleared, I think that we'll run out of time. I would urge the defeat of this motion.

**Jeffrey H. Orleans** (Ivy Group): In response, first, to the second question. I conducted OCR reviews on both sides of the fence for 20 years. It is my clear view that these young women would be counted for participant purposes on the first day of competition and the fact that they have practiced with or without certification would not affect the institution's compliance counting status.

That is the way my institution and others with crew have done it for many years. We have had many institutions that have undergone OCR reviews. I don't think that would be an issue at all.

To respond to Carol's question, we would not anticipate that anyone would be competing in the formal spring season that leads up to the championship, which we are going to vote on later in Proposal No. 99, unless they have been certified under any circumstances. So, if I am understanding your question correctly, Carol, we would not have a violation.

Finally, I would just like to say in response to the comments that the 45-day period is ample to certify walk-ons in the sport of crew. The institutions that row said to this body that 45 days has not proven adequate to certify the large numbers of young men and women who come to row with no prior experience and who go through the clearinghouse, which, as we all know despite vast improvement, is not equipped to handle large numbers of unrecruited student-athletes in that short of time frame.

I would urge this body to support the young women of the United States who want to row in an increasing number of American colleges and vote for passage of Proposal No. 61. Thank you.

**Averill C. Haines** (Boston University): I am currently a compliance officer. We sponsor women's crew at a very high level. Because of our visibility, because of the encouragement that we provide the student-athletes to come on out and learn the sport of crew while attending Boston University, we have a large number turn out. Sometimes in excess of 150 young women take advantage of the opportunity to try out for crew. We sponsor 24 programs, 13 of which are in operation in the

fall. As long as we continue to operate under the initial-eligibility clearinghouse, it does not lend itself to practical certification.

We get a 45-day period for these young women. The backlash is actually occurring at the student-athlete level. Many of the young women come to Boston University and they take some time to register, they get adjusted, they learn about crew. They don't even begin the 45-day opportunity to register with the clearinghouse until some time in the middle of September. At that juncture, we are wrestling with the certification from the eligibility clearinghouse for all of those prospects who are attempting an official visit prior to the initial letter of intent signing date. It is impossible to get some responses from our initial-eligibility clearinghouse with regard to women's crew novices and what their status is in the registration process.

I urge support of this proposal for this extension. I do not believe that it gives a competitive advantage to anyone. Actually, it is serving to benefit the student-athlete in her opportunity to participate. Thank you.

**Christine H. B. Grant** (University of Iowa): I would like to support the comments of the previous speaker. The University of Iowa last year had 70 young women in crew. We have had more than that number try out. All of those students were recruited from on campus. None of them were recruited off campus. I think that is fantastic. That makes the sport very different to every other sport in our program. I urge you to support it. Thank you.

**Kenneth E. Surma** (University of Illinois, Chicago): I wish you would go back to the vital issue. If that person does practice and is not cleared by the clearinghouse and comes back as a nonqualifier, that person is not able to practice. Therefore, is it a violation? Will you answer that, please?

**Carolyn Campbell** (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, our anticipation was that it would work the same way as it does now. If someone is practicing for 45 days and then is not certified by the clearinghouse, that is not considered a violation currently.

This would just extend that period for crew. So my assumption would be that it would not be a violation if they were found not to be a qualifier after having practiced.

[Proposal No. 61 (Page A-144) was adopted upon reconsideration.]

#### **Playing and Practice Seasons—Divisions I and II Tennis**

**Barbara Church** (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): I move adoption of Proposal No. 71.

[The motion was seconded.]

[Proposal No. 71 (Page A-171) was adopted.]

#### **Contest Exemptions—Division I Basketball**

**John R. May** (Rice University): As a member of the Special Events Committee and on behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 78.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Great Eight Basketball Festival is a primary vehicle for publicizing the CHAMPS/Life Skills programs. At the same time, it also serves as a significant funding source. The Great Eight exemption will



allow the continuation and enhancement of this popular and beneficial basketball festival.

If approved, the sponsors intend to immediately forward this proposal to the Special Events Committee so it can be thoroughly reviewed under the exemption criteria just adopted under Proposal No. 69. In September 1995, the CHAMPS program was merged with the NCAA's response to a Life Skills program in an effort to maximize the benefits of both to the student-athletes. This merger should also result in greater visibility and viability of Life Skills programs and the creation of new ones. The sponsors and the Special Events Committee feel that the festival is a win-win situation for both the players and the institutions who participate, as well as the nonparticipating student-athletes who attend Division I institutions and benefit from the CHAMPS/Life Skills programs promoted and funded in part by the Great Eight Basketball Festival.

The national exposure to CHAMPS/Life Skills provided by the Great Eight will deliver a very positive message about the efforts being made on a rapidly expanding number of campuses to help prepare student-athletes for life during and after intercollegiate athletics. The potential benefit of the CHAMPS/Life Skills seems undeniable if the exception is granted and the Great Eight Festival is not only to survive but allowed to flourish. Both the sponsors and the Special Events Committee urge your support of Proposal No. 78. Thank you.

**James P. O'Hanlon** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I urge you to defeat this proposal.

The Council does not believe Division I institutions need yet another exempted contest in the sport of basketball, especially an annual exemption. The exempted contest in the sport places increased time demands upon the student-athletes. Earlier, we adopted legislation to create a certification process for certain events in order for them to be exempted. To have this be an annual exemption, when many of the other events contemplated for certification in Proposal No. 69 have a one- to four-year exemption, doesn't seem to be wise. I ask you to vote "no" on Proposal No. 78.

**Wright Waters** (Southern Conference): I urge our colleagues in Divisions I-A and I-AA to vote in support of Proposal No. 78. This summer the Southern Conference will have a leadership institute. This is to identify the student-athletes on our campuses who have a desire to be more active leaders on own campuses but may need the competence and skills to do so. Funding for our project is made possible by an increase in the NCAA grant program, but because of the other requirements, it will be forced to supplement the grant. As I understand Proposal No. 78, additional moneys for our programs and similar programs of other conferences will be available to the CHAMPS/Life Skills programs.

We would in general look to Division I-A athletics for our leadership in establishing a program that has direct benefits to student-athletes. For those concerned about a competitive advantage in the teams selected to play, I would suggest to you that these institutions have an advantage that would exist with or without this tournament. The real value here is what we can do for the student-athlete. So vote for Pro-

posal No. 78 for our most important resource, the student-athletes. I urge your support of Proposal No. 78.

**Dutch Baughman** (Oregon State University): The NCAA has assumed responsibility for the development and distribution of all materials that support the CHAMPS/Life Skills programs across the country and for the training of the personnel with the programs on their campuses.

Also with this partnership, the Division I-A athletics directors association has two primary responsibilities. One is to assume the leadership role and encourage each member school in the development, funding and administration of the CHAMPS/Life Skills programs. Number two is to promote and market CHAMPS/Life Skills in a way that will showcase the positive nature of intercollegiate athletics. This is where the Great Eight comes in. The two primary reasons for the existence of the Great Eight are to promote the CHAMPS/Life Skills programs and to assist with the funding of the CHAMPS/Life Skills programs on our campuses. The Great Eight provides a public forum that reaches national exposure with the consistent promotion of the CHAMPS/Life Skills programs. ESPN provides advertisement for the CHAMPS/Life Skills programs up to and during the Great Eight Festival at a value of \$750,000. ESPN is telling America what we are doing on our campuses to prepare our student-athletes to be more productive citizens in our society.

If the perception of Division I athletics is a commercialized business, then the wholesome, productive and positive nature of CHAMPS/Life Skills is an essential element of our image. Since we have had two years of history with the Great Eight, here are some significant facts. Sixteen different schools have participated in the Great Eight. Two have been from I-AA. The Great Eight will generate \$700,000, which will be distributed by the NCAA educational services office by providing a grant to two I-AA conferences and two I-AAA conferences in the amount of \$500,000 a year for each of the next three years. The Great Eight will generate \$1,000 for each school that has a CHAMPS/Life Skills program. The Great Eight will generate funding for I-AA and I-AAA CHAMPS/Life Skills campus representatives to attend the Life Skills program, which is necessary on an annual basis in order to sustain the annual funding on a reoccurring basis.

If I am not mistaken, the Great Eight is the only event seeking an exemption that generates funding for the specific and direct purposes to support the student-athlete. Many schools will not be able to create the best possible CHAMPS/Life Skills programs without the help from the Great Eight. I urge your support of this proposal to make it happen for the sake of our student-athletes. Thank you.

**Kenneth A. Free** (Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference): I speak in support of Proposal No. 78. I know that we have a lot of exemptions in basketball, perhaps even too many. Proposal No. 69, which was presented by the special committee, has addressed the issues that have caused many of us to be sorry for all exemptions, not just this one.

If there is such a thing as a good exemption, and I believe that there is, then this exemption should be approved. There are several reasons why I believe in this proposal, namely, two. Number one, it promotes a



great cause. All of our schools will do well to have CHAMPS/Life Skills programs and the Great Eight is totally committed to this cause. We are fortunate to have ESPN working with us and putting a better face on college athletics.

Number two, all of the proceeds received by the athletics directors is earmarked for this program in all of our schools, not just the Division I-A schools. That figure is only for two years and is approximately one-half million dollars. You may say why should I vote for it? Well, we will endeavor to explain it. The team is a family. The final eight teams from the previous year are invited. If there is a refusal, they go to the final season rankings. The reason this event is attractive is because they take the top teams.

That is the reason they put it on TV and that is the reason they have a nice pay-off to support CHAMPS/Life Skills in all of our schools. From all I gather, the I-A schools are solidly behind this program. I urge I-AA and I-AAA to support this program.

**DeLores S. Todd** (Atlantic Coast Conference): I urge the membership to support Proposal No. 78 for the annual exemption to those teams participating in the Great Eight. This is not any different than exempting our colleges in Alaska and Hawaii. I believe that the same consideration should be extended relative to this event. Before 1995, the Great Eight had proceeds of \$400,000, which were contributed directly to the CHAMPS/Life Skills programs. Without this exemption status, it is a strong possibility that this event would go by the wayside.

I ask all to set aside their prejudices to let this event go forward to generate revenues for a very, very worthy program. Thank you.

**Mike Hamrick** (East Carolina University): As one of the first five universities engaged in the CHAMPS/Life Skills program, I can attach considerable benefits that this program brings the student-athletes. Such programs, as we all know, require considerable resources. As we all know, Proposal No. 78 provides these resources. I urge your support.

**Brother Thomas J. Scanlan** (Manhattan College): I make a motion that we refer Proposal No. 78 to the Special Committee to Review Contest Exemptions, as we did on Proposal No. 69-4.

[The motion was seconded.]

There is, from time to time in the course of our government, when it may make sense to flip-flop and change our position. About 23 minutes ago, we overwhelmingly passed No. 69 to set up a structure, a criterion and a methodology to deal with exemptions. I believe that we should follow that and not 22 minutes later "end run" the process.

**William Haigh** (North Carolina State University): I want to make this point. If the motion is referred to the committee, the Great Eight will die. The momentum will be lost and the opportunities to have this event sponsored by ESPN will be lost. So referring it effectively kills the proposal. I urge you not to refer this to the committee.

[The motion to refer was defeated.]

[Proposal No. 78 (Page A-180) was adopted.]

## Playing and Practice Seasons—First Contest Date— Divisions I and II Soccer

**Lyman W. Porter** (University of California, Irvine): On behalf of the sponsors, I would like to move Proposal No. 80.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would change the starting date for competition in the sports of Divisions I and II soccer so that it is consistent with the starting date for women's volleyball. If adopted, this proposal would allow institutions to participate in soccer competition the Labor Day weekend when it falls on either September 1 or 2. At many institutions, Labor Day weekend is a good weekend for hosting a soccer event in terms of marketing and attendance.

Furthermore, with the passage of this proposal, the institution will be allowed to play its alumni contest the weekend prior to September 1 when that date does not fall on either Saturday, Sunday or Monday. This proposal is noncontroversial. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 80 (Page A-182) was adopted.]

**Mr. Sweazy:** Proposal 99 is the next proposal that should be considered and may take some time. Therefore, we are going to stop and consider the two motions for waivers and have the election of officers.

## WAIVERS

[Note: The Division I business session heard petitions for waivers of Division I membership from the University of Colorado, Boulder, and Mankato State University. The petitions were approved.]

## NOMINATING COMMITTEE

[Note: The slate for Division I representatives to the Council was approved as presented.]

**Mr. Sweazy:** Proposal No. 99 has several amendments. I do not believe that in the eight or nine remaining minutes we could complete our deliberations on Proposal No. 99, so we will not attempt that. We will leave that to this afternoon's general session, which begins in this room at 1:30.

I would like to say one thing. Bill Sangster, Division I vice-president, regrets very much not being able to be here. He has been of great service to the academic community and to the athletics community. We all owe him a great deal of gratitude. So please, in the coming weeks, keep Bill in your thoughts and prayers.

Thank you, and we are adjourned until 1:30 for the general business session.

[The Division I business session adjourned at 11:55 a.m.]



# ■ NCAA Honors Dinner

Sunday Evening, January 7, 1996

## WELCOME

**President Corrigan:** Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the Association's 31st annual honors program. Please rise for the invocation, which will be presented by Dr. William Finnan, chaplain of Southern Methodist University. After the invocation, please enjoy your meal, and we will be back with our presentations.

## INVOCATION

**William Finnan** (Southern Methodist University): Will you join me in an attitude of prayer. Let us pray.

Eternal spirit of the unexpected, surprise us with your presence this evening. We are not strangers to you. You have celebrated with us on occasions of our victories, our times of triumph, and you have not abandoned us in times of loss and defeat. You know us better than we know ourselves, and still you extend your care to us.

This evening, we have come to honor athletes, both young and old, whose embodied discipline and lived commitment have established new standards for personal excellence. Bless them. Inspired by their achievements, we are renewed and sustained.

Now, sustain in us visions which drew us first toward our fields of vocation and competition and service. Now, as we break bread together across the table this evening, accept our gratitude, not only for this food, but for the enduring fellowship of play, the friendship of team and the community of athletics competition. We humbly offer as our prayer this evening. Amen.

*[Note: Dinner was served to the delegates.]*

## INTRODUCTIONS

**President Corrigan:** I realize that some of you may not have finished your meals, but we have an exciting program and we want to get started with it. So, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor for me to introduce our emcee and a few other people at the head table.

This has always been a very special event at the NCAA Convention. It is always, I think, our highlight to see what the very best can do. I want you to also know that tonight I changed my tie so you would not notice my glasses. (Laughter)

This is a special night. We take time from our busy schedule to do what we always wish we could do every day of the year, and that is to honor the very best that college athletics has to offer. As we listen tonight to the tremendous achievements of the men and women on the dais, we are reminded of our real mission — to help build character in

young men and women, while at the same time to provide them an opportunity to compete at whatever level of athletics they choose.

Sitting before you are outstanding examples of the perfect mix of character, brain-power and athletics ability. So, please enjoy with me the fine stories of the NCAA honors program, "Class of 1996."

At this time, I would like to introduce individuals sharing the dais who will not be specifically acknowledged later in the program. The chair of the NCAA Honors Committee, which is responsible for selecting our honorees and planning our program, is the director of athletics at the University of Washington, Barbara Hedges. An outstanding athletics administrator, our secretary-treasurer has represented inter-collegiate athletics with considerable skill for many years. Please welcome Phyllis Howlett, assistant commissioner of the Big Ten Conference. The next individual you really already know. He continues to serve student-athletes as he has done for so much of his professional life. Please give a warm welcome to our executive director, Ced Dempsey. (Applause)

## INTRODUCTION OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES

**President Corrigan:** Tonight, we have a master of ceremonies who epitomizes the term "student-athlete." Tonight he becomes only the second individual ever to move from our Silver Anniversary dais to the honors dinner emcee podium. If you will take a look at your program, you will see Bob was one of the most proficient quarterbacks in college and professional history. A two-time all-American at Purdue University, he led the Boilermakers to their only Rose Bowl appearance, a 14-13 victory over Southern Cal. An industrial economics major, Bob finished his career ranked seventh in NCAA total offense. While at Purdue, he established nearly two dozen school records. A first-round draft choice, he helped make the Miami Dolphins one of the most successful franchises in professional football. During his 14-year career, he passed for more than 25,000 yards, 192 touchdowns, and led his team to three straight Super Bowls and two NFL championships. In 1972, he guided the Dolphins to a perfect 17-0 record; the last perfect season in the NFL.

Bob has continued to use his vast knowledge of football as one of the most respected analysts in broadcasting. These days, his son, Brian, is creating the same excitement in college as Bob did at Purdue. Brian is doing it as starting quarterback at the University of Michigan. There he is. (Applause) Do you wonder who the other emcee was? It was Merlin Olsen, who won a Silver Anniversary Award in 1987 and was the emcee in 1992.

You have heard about Brian. There is also Scott, who is a walk-on football player at the University of Virginia, and Jeff, who was a walk-on football player at the University of North Carolina. This is a wonderful father, a wonderful man. Ladies and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure for me to introduce to you tonight's master of ceremonies, Bob Griese.

## INTRODUCTION OF TODAY'S TOP VIII

**Bob Griese:** Thank you, Gene. It is a real pleasure to be with you, because the last time we were together, you walked off the 18th green



owing me 10 bucks. (Laughter)

You know, another friend of mine who has emceed this thing several times is my broadcast partner, Keith Jackson. I am sure you all heard a few "Whoa Nellies!" when he was around here. He gave me a new one, though, at the Rose Bowl. You always have to listen. That is one of the things that being an analyst you have to do, listen to your partner. He came up with one at this Rose Bowl that I had to call him on. The touchdown was about to be scored, and he didn't know whether or not it was going to be scored. He said something like, "Whoa, Nellie!... I don't see any hands going up toward hallelujah land," or something like that. (Laughter) You always have to be listening with him.

But this is a real treat for me to be here tonight. I am trying to squeeze in another year or two of eligibility so that I can pull the first "honors dinner triple crown." I'm going from that side of the dais over there, where the Silver Anniversary winners are, to this position, being an emcee, and then over here where we have all the intellectuals, the Top VIII, who you will be meeting a little bit later. But as a "returning starter" at this dinner, I am looking forward to sharing with you the terrific stories of the people who we will honor this evening.

I applaud you for taking the time to honor these individuals tonight. In my job at ABC Sports, I am fortunate to be able to spend a lot of time with some of these outstanding athletes. They don't often get the credit they deserve, so I hope you savor this evening as much as I will. If you are like me, as you watch and listen to these stories, you will find yourself saying, "How do they find time to do all this?"

Okay. Let's get right to it. We will start by calling attention to your program, which lists the student-athletes who have been named Walter Byers scholars and those who have received NCAA postgraduate scholarships during the past year. The NCAA postgraduate scholarship program began in 1964. Since that time, the Association has invested more than \$7 million in postgraduate scholarships to more than 2,800 student-athletes. We congratulate each of those outstanding student-athletes and the institutions that they represent.

Tonight's program permits the Association to honor eight outstanding student-athletes from 1995 and six former letterwinners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates. Now, I take great pleasure in introducing the current student-athletes to you.

*Charlaine Coetzee, Longwood College, golf.*

Division II golfers are glad to have seen the last of Charlaine. Now, one of them has a chance to win an NCAA championship.

Charlaine won the last three Division II championships sponsored by the National Golf Coaches Association. As a junior, she set the tournament record with rounds of 71, 71 and 70.

A four-time Division II all-American, Charlaine's stroke average has been the best in Division II for the past two seasons. She led Longwood to two national championships in the last three years. Charlaine was honored in 1994 by Golf World magazine as one of the top-50 players in all of women's collegiate golf.

While Charlaine's scores on the golf course were close to par, her

work in the classroom was well above that. Her 3.62 grade-point average included two semesters of perfect 4.0 work. A history major, Charlaine earned dean's list honors six times and was named to the all-scholar academic team this year by the National Golf Coaches Association. Charlaine has spoken to high-school students about the importance of academics and served as a peer tutor in history and geography.

We were going to give Charlaine tonight's "long distance award." She was traveling here from her home in Cape Town, South Africa. Unfortunately, she is stuck in London with visa problems.

Accepting Charlaine's award from Dr. William Dorrill, president of Longwood, is Cindy Ho, head women's golf coach at Longwood. Ladies and gentlemen, Charlaine Coetzee, Longwood College. (Applause)

*Aaron Graham, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, football.*

Coming into this season, many wondered if Nebraska's offensive engine would still roar behind an offensive line that lost all but one starter. Fortunately for the Cornhuskers, the one remaining starter was center Aaron Graham.

Anchored by Aaron, the Nebraska offense didn't miss a beat. Ranked at the top of the polls all year, the Cornhuskers racked up some awesome numbers, more than 560 yards of offense per game, 400 of them on the ground. Nebraska scored a Big Eight record of more than 52 points per game this season. The Cornhuskers bulldozed their way to an astounding seven yards per carry, with Aaron leading the way with nine "pancake blocks" per game. But he and his linemates didn't just run-block; they protected their all-American quarterback as well. Not once did an opposing lineman break through to sack Tommy Frazier.

Through it all, Aaron graded out nearly perfectly every game. Aaron, who owns a 3.3 grade-point average in the classroom, was whistled for one penalty all season. No wonder his coach calls him perhaps the best center ever to play for the Huskers. Aaron, an animal science major, has volunteered in a special-education program for the past two years and as a speaker in a support group for kids who have lost a parent through death.

Aaron will receive his award from Joan Leitzel, interim chancellor at Nebraska. Ladies and gentlemen, Aaron Graham, University of Nebraska, Lincoln. (Applause)

*Emilie Hanson, Central College (Iowa), basketball.*

As an English major, Emilie wrote and rewrote dozens of papers. But her biggest "rewrite" job was the one she did on the Central College basketball records book.

Emilie didn't wait long to make her mark at Central College. As a sophomore, she sank the winning basket in Central's victory in the national semifinals. The next night, she scored 26 points to lead her team to the national championship. After that, there was no stopping her. In her junior year, she poured in 29 points per game and won the Division III scoring title. For good measure that year, she also topped the nation in free-throw percentage. Last year, she averaged 28 points, won the scoring title again and was named Division III player of the year. To put it in perspective, in her last 52 games, Emilie scored 20



points or more 47 times.

Emilie rang up huge numbers in the classroom as well, graduating with a 3.89 grade-point average. A two-time academic all-American, she won an NCAA postgraduate scholarship and was one of the 10 finalists last fall for the NCAA Woman of the Year award.

She is outstanding. Emilie has served as a tutor in an Upward Bound program for disadvantaged high-school students and spoke frequently to church youth groups. She also wrote for the school newspaper one year, which may explain some of the large headlines she received that year. (Laughter)

Emilie will receive her award from Ken Weller, president emeritus of Central College. Ladies and gentlemen, Emilie Hanson, Central College of Iowa. (Applause)

*Rebecca Lobo, University of Connecticut, basketball.*

Last season's undefeated Connecticut team was a flame that ignited the sport of women's basketball. Rebecca Lobo was the match that lit that flame.

The list of Rebecca's accomplishments on and off the court reads like a long novel. Last year's consensus player of the year finished her career with more than 2,100 points and nearly 1,300 rebounds. She blocked nearly 400 shots, a number that ranks her third all-time in the NCAA. En route to their 35-0 national championship season, Rebecca and her teammates sparked unprecedented national interest in women's basketball. They capped off their dream season at a sold-out Final Four, and to no one's surprise, Rebecca shot, rebounded and blocked her way to the tournament's most-outstanding-player award.

Rebecca was equally as impressive off of the court. She graduated with a 3.6 grade-point average with a major in political science, an appropriate degree, because last April she probably could have been elected governor of Connecticut. Little wonder, then, that Rebecca was named NCAA Woman of the Year for 1995.

Rebecca now turns her attention to the international scene as part of the U.S. national team. She hopes to help lead the United States to Olympic gold this summer. I used to play a little basketball myself in Indiana. I will take Rebecca and Emilie and play anybody that wants to play us three on three. (Laughter)

Rebecca has worked for several charitable causes in Connecticut, including the American Lung Association and a local breast cancer foundation.

Unfortunately, Rebecca is snowbound in our nation's capital this evening. The Connecticut senior woman administrator will accept her award from Lew Perkins, athletics director at Connecticut.

Ladies and gentlemen, Rebecca Lobo, University of Connecticut. (Applause)

*Greg Myers, Colorado State University, football.*

Greg is an old-fashioned double-threat on the football field as a defensive back and as a punt returner. Either way, it is always bad news for the opponent when Greg touches the ball.

Versatile Greg Myers has left a legacy at Colorado State that future Ram players will find hard to duplicate. As a junior, he became the first Ram since 1978 to earn first-team all-American honors. He dupli-

cated that feat last month when the AP named him to its 1995 first-team all-America squad.

Greg intercepted 15 passes during his collegiate career, including this one in the last minute that preserved this year's victory over Air Force. He capped off his terrific career by winning the Jim Thorpe Award, given annually to the nation's best defensive back. Greg is the Western Athletic Conference's career leader in punt-return yardage. This year, he averaged 16 yards per return and took back three of those returns for touchdowns. He is the first player in WAC history to earn first-team all-conference honors four times.

He earned honors off the field as well, sporting a 3.71 grade-point average with a degree in biological sciences. A 3.71 as a defensive back? I didn't think they made them that smart. (Laughter)

Greg volunteered at a community outreach program in Colorado and currently serves as president of the student-athlete advisory committee at Colorado State.

Greg will receive his award from Tom Jurich, athletics director at Colorado State. Ladies and gentlemen, Greg Myers, Colorado State University. (Applause)

*Cheril Santini, Southern Methodist University, diving.*

Cheril fashions herself as a juggler. She has juggled her research, her studies, her athletics and all her other activities. She hasn't dropped the ball yet on any of those pursuits.

Cheril Santini made quite an entry into NCAA diving annals. She won the one-meter springboard title as a freshman at the 1992 NCAA championships, becoming only the second freshman ever to win an NCAA women's title. She won the event again last year, and in between, she sandwiched five more top-five finishes at the one-meter, three-meter and 10-meter heights, all while overcoming the effects of a broken hand.

Cheril displayed the same versatility at several U.S. national diving championships, posting four top-five finishes in all three events in a two-year span. She was a finalist at the 1992 U.S. Olympic diving trials and finished fourth in the one-meter at the 1994 World Championships.

A 10-time all-American, Cheril dove into her studies with equal abandon, graduating with a 3.96 with majors in chemistry and German. She also minored in math and worked as a research assistant in the SMU chemistry lab. Cheril has written papers for two prestigious chemistry journals. She served as a mentor and tutor at Dallas area elementary schools, and served for three years as president of the SMU chapter of Amnesty International.

Cheril will receive her award from Gerald Turner, president of SMU. Ladies and gentlemen, Cheril Santini, Southern Methodist University. (Applause)

*Jenny Thompson, Stanford University, swimming.*

Not only is Jenny Thompson one of the greatest swimmers in NCAA championships history, she already has had an outstanding career in international competition.

Jenny Thompson finished her college career with 19 NCAA championships, the most ever in NCAA competition. She won nine individual



titles, including four consecutive in the 100 meters, only the fifth woman in NCAA history to accomplish that feat. Jenny won 26 Pac-10 titles in her career and led Stanford to a perfect four-year record. During her career, the Cardinal won the NCAA title all four years. They won all four Pac-10 crowns and posted a 27-0 dual meet record.

A human biology major with a 3.2 grade-point average, Jenny's accomplishments in international competition are equally astounding. She won two gold medals and a silver at the 1992 Olympics in Barcelona. The five-time national high-school champion won gold as a 14-year-old at the 1987 Pan-Am Games. She won a meet-record six gold medals at the 1993 Pan-Pacific Games, the second best individual performance ever at an international swim meet.

She has somehow found time to help raise funds for a cancer foundation, has worked at several Special Olympics sessions and has volunteered at Stanford's youth olympics.

Jenny will receive her award from Ted Leland, athletics director at Stanford. Ladies and gentlemen, Jenny Thompson, Stanford University. (Applause)

*Carla Ainsworth, Kenyon College, swimming.*

To paraphrase an old rhetorical question: What can you say about a person who has won almost everything?

Carla Ainsworth has won almost everything. She won 11 individual NCAA Division III titles, and won 15 more as part of various relay teams. That is 26 NCAA titles, more than any athlete in any division of NCAA competition.

Carla holds or shares seven NCAA records and has qualified for all-America status 28 times. She became the first woman to win the NCAA 200-meter freestyle four years in a row and only the second woman to win the 100 freestyle four years in a row. College Sports magazine named her Division III athlete of the year in 1995. The most outstanding swimmer at three NCAA championships, Carla helped extend Kenyon's amazing streak of team titles to 12 consecutive years.

Carla didn't exactly let up when she wasn't in the pool. She graduated with a 3.73 grade-point average majoring in chemistry and history. She won several scholarships at Kenyon, including one from the National Endowment for the Humanities. A four-time academic all-American, she won the NCAA's Walter Byers postgraduate scholarship in 1995. Carla was president of her senior class and was active in the Big Brothers/Big Sisters program. She is now pursuing a medical degree at Washington University in St. Louis.

Carla will receive her award from Robert Bunnell, director of athletics at Kenyon. Ladies and gentlemen, Carla Ainsworth, Kenyon College. (Applause)

Carla will now respond on behalf of the current student-athletes. Carla.

**Carla Ainsworth** (Kenyon College): Good evening. There are two running speculations as to why I was chosen to do this. My suggestion is that I was first in alphabetical order so, of course, that is how I got to do it. I think the other choice is to prove to you that I am actually Carla Ainsworth. I don't really look like the person you saw in those pictures.

On behalf of the other Top VIII honorees, I would first like to thank the NCAA for this wonderful honor. Whenever someone tells you that you have done an exceptional job and it deserves to be recognized, it is special. I noted that any one of us could stand here and acknowledge the many people who have contributed to our successes, supporting us and challenging us and celebrating our victories and helping us overcome our setbacks. Our coaches and parents would certainly fall in that category.

As I considered what I was going to say to you this evening, I was trying to figure out what, if any, unique experience I could bring to my remarks. I am surrounded by a combination of individuals and teams with NCAA championships, motivational speakers, international competitors, Phi Beta Kappas, and the list goes on and on.

But I doubt that any of us woke up every morning in college and said to ourselves: "So, I am going to do something exceptional today." We just did the things we found interesting and enjoyable and committed ourselves to trying our best, which sometimes generated some pretty amazing results. As I thought about it, I realized I have had the opportunity to learn the most about myself and the impact of college sports in my life since I retired six months ago. When something is gone from your life, you remember the things you sometimes took for granted.

On behalf of the Top VIII honorees, some who are still competing and some who are not, I would like to thank those who don't get thanks first—our academic institutions and athletics departments—for providing an environment that not only allowed us to achieve as students and as athletes and leaders, but encouraged us to do so. Our extended family and friends who came to the games and the tournaments, even though we told them they didn't have to, because they really knew it was important to us. I would like to extend a special thanks to our teammates who are not here to hear it, because the teammates are what sets that collegiate sport apart, and the men and women working together toward common goals, and it makes the celebration that much sweeter. I don't think any of you would have accomplished the individual things that we did without our team and our teammates. I know I wouldn't have.

Lastly, I would like to thank the NCAA again for continuing to seek out and praise excellence at all levels. Thank you all and good luck to all the honorees in the future wherever their life may lead them. (Applause)

**Mr. Grieser:** Thank you, Carla. Let's have a round of applause for all of our Top VIII honorees. (Applause) Good luck and Godspeed.

#### SILVER ANNIVERSARY HONOREES

**Mr. Grieser:** And now, let's meet this year's Silver Anniversary Honorees.

*Marty Liquori, Villanova University, track*

Marty Liquori burst onto the running scene early by becoming only the third high-school miler in U.S. history to run a four-minute mile. But that was just the beginning. A five-time NCAA individual champion, Marty won three consecutive outdoor one-mile championships. He



won nine Penn Relays and seven IC4A championships.

Not yet a college sophomore, Marty in 1968 became the youngest person ever to reach the 1,500-meter finals at the Olympics. By the next year, he was the top-ranked miler in the world, and he won the 1,500-meter run at the 1971 Pan-American Games. That same year, he edged out Jim Ryun in a dramatic confrontation that was dubbed "The Dream Mile."

By 1977, Marty had become the top 5,000-meter runner in the world. He held American records in the 2,000 and 5,000 meters and the two-mile run. Marty then switched from running track to covering track. Nineteen-ninety-five marks his 25th year with ABC Sports. He has covered four Olympic Games, 14 New York Marathons and numerous track and field championships. He serves as host and executive producer of "Running and Racing," an endurance sports show now in its ninth year on ESPN. Just six weeks ago, Marty was inducted into the U.S. Track and Field Hall of Fame. Twenty-five years with ABC Sports...Have you ever worked with my man, Keith? Oh, boy!

Marty was the winner of an NCAA postgraduate scholarship back in 1972 and has served as national coach for "Team in Training," a program that raises funds for the Leukemia Society of America. He is president of a group of sporting goods outlets that has grown to over 250 stores.

Marty will receive his award from Gene DeFillipo, director of athletics at Villanova. Ladies and gentlemen, Marty Liquori, Villanova University. (Applause)

*Cliff Meely, University of Colorado, Boulder, basketball.*

Cliff Meely honed his basketball skills on the playgrounds of Chicago and perfected them in Colorado. Now he devotes his time helping young people strive for success.

Perhaps no one has played basketball for the Colorado Buffaloes as Cliff Meely did. Before he graduated, Meely earned all-America honors and rewrote Colorado's record book. All-time points leader, most points per game, among the leaders in rebounds and free throws, Cliff Meely could do it all. He finished with eight conference records and led the Buffs to their last Big Eight title.

Off the court, Meely participated in playground clinics for inner-city youth, and was involved in federal government sponsor camps.

Meely was chosen in the first round by both the NBA and the ABA. But a bad back plagued him during his six years with the Houston Rockets and the Los Angeles Lakers and the dream soon faded. It was textbook, the loss of the spotlight, an avalanche of personal problems and a well-chronicled battle with drugs. But Cliff Meely bounced back and now he works hard to prevent other young people from enduring that same pain. Cliff is a specialist in the Boulder public school system, keeping young people in school, counseling them to stay focused on their education.

Cliff will receive his award from Jim Corbridge, faculty athletics representative at Colorado. Ladies and gentlemen, Cliff Meely, University of Colorado, Boulder. (Applause)

*Kurt Schmoke, Yale University, football and lacrosse.*

Kurt Schmoke kept himself quite busy as a Yale undergraduate. He

must have liked the pace, because he hasn't slowed down one bit.

Kurt Schmoke began his college athletics career as the quarterback of the Yale freshman football team. He then played two seasons as a defensive back on the varsity football team, sandwiched around three seasons as an attackman on the varsity lacrosse team.

Kurt attacked his schoolwork and extra-curricular activities with equal vigor. He cofounded the Calvin Hill Day Care Center specifically for the children of Yale employees. He was secretary of his senior class and ultimately received a Rhodes scholarship. Kurt earned his law degree from Harvard in 1976, and a year later was appointed to the domestic policy staff under President Jimmy Carter.

In 1982, he was elected Baltimore's chief prosecuting officer. He promptly created a full-time narcotics unit and set up separate units to handle cases involving domestic violence and child abuse. Suitably impressed, the citizens of Baltimore elected him the city's mayor in 1987.

Among other initiatives, he developed a program to guarantee job opportunities or college financial assistance to qualified high-school graduates. He also initiated policies designed to improve the participation of women and minority entrepreneurs in the economic life of Baltimore. The citizens of Baltimore have reelected him twice, including two months ago when he gained a 75-percent plurality.

Kurt is another casualty of the blizzard that's hitting the East Coast. Jeff Orleans, commissioner of the Ivy Group, will accept his award from Thomas Beckett, director of athletics at Yale. Ladies and gentlemen, Kurt Schmoke, Yale University. (Applause)

*Joe Theismann, University of Notre Dame, football.*

Joe Theismann is known as perhaps the most versatile in a long line of outstanding Notre Dame quarterbacks. He has extended that versatility into his life after football.

Joe Theismann owns more records in South Bend than the local Sam Goody's. He passed for more than 4,400 yards and 31 touchdowns during his career. He also ran for more than 1,000 yards and scored 16 touchdowns on the ground. In addition, he returned punts and caught two passes. His banner year was 1970. Eight times that season he threw for over 200 yards, including a 526-yard effort against Southern California. He finished second that year behind Stanford's Jim Plunkett in the Heisman Trophy balloting. Joe played in 163 consecutive games for the NFL's Washington Redskins, throwing for more than 25,000 yards. He was named the NFL's most valuable player in 1983, and engineered the Redskins' 27-17 victory in Super Bowl XVII.

An inductee into the CoSIDA Academic Hall of Fame, Joe is currently CEO of the corporation that manages three "Joe Theismann's" restaurants. He served as an NFL analyst for CBS Sports for two years and has performed that role for ESPN since 1988. Joe was named NFL Man of the Year in 1982 for his work with charitable causes, including the Children's Miracle Network and the United Way. The fact that Joe returned punts just goes to show you that sometimes he is not always there.

Joe will receive his award from Father William Beauchamp, executive vice-president at Notre Dame. Ladies and gentlemen, Joe Theis-



mann, University of Notre Dame. (Applause)

*Jack Youngblood, University of Florida, football.*

When the list of football's most dominating defensive players is compiled, this man's name will undoubtedly be near the top of the list.

Jack Youngblood starred for three years as a stalwart defensive end at the University of Florida. He was named to the all-Southeastern Conference team in 1970, and earned all-America honors that same year. He was the most valuable player in the 1971 Senior Bowl and later was named to the all-Southeastern Conference quarter-century team for the years 1950 to 1975.

A first-round draft pick of the Los Angeles Rams, Jack played in seven Pro Bowl games during his 14-year career. Twice he was honored as NFC defensive player of the year, partly in recognition of plays like this one. Jack played in 201 consecutive games, still a Rams' record. That streak included the 1979 Super Bowl, in which he played with a broken leg.

Following his playing career, Jack embarked on a successful administrative career in professional football, first with the Rams and now as vice-president of the successful Orlando franchise of the Arena Football League.

Quarterbacks don't like defensive ends. That is why Jack is all the way down on the end. Joe, you will have to look out. He is right behind you. This one was a good one right here. Jack has been an active spokesperson for the United Way and for Child Help USA, an organization that benefits abused children.

Jack will receive his award from Dr. John Lombardi, president of the University of Florida. Ladies and gentlemen, Jack Youngblood, University of Florida. (Applause)

*Tommy Lyons, University of Georgia, football.*

Perhaps it was fitting that Tommy Lyons would go from a football career to a career in medicine. After all, he has undergone about a half dozen knee surgeries himself.

Tommy Lyons came to the University of Georgia as a tight end, but the coaches quickly switched him to center. That move paid immediate dividends. Lyons became a three-year starter, a two-time all-American and team captain his senior year. An outstanding all-round athlete, Lyons also won three straight Southeast Intercollegiate wrestling championships.

He was drafted by the NFL's Denver Broncos, and by the end of his rookie season, he was starting at offensive guard. Despite his relatively small size, Lyons started in 49 consecutive games before suffering a broken leg. At that time, many wondered if he would perform the surgery on himself, because during four of his years with the Broncos, he was also attending medical school at the University of Colorado. After a six-year career, Lyons put that schooling to good use. He has become an internationally respected leader in the field of medicine.

Lyons has pioneered a revolutionary procedure for endoscopic surgery, one that causes less pain, less risk and less recuperative time for hysterectomies and other gynecological surgeries. His procedure has been taught to leading OB/GYN surgeons throughout the United States.

On top of all that, Tommy is an accomplished pianist. He has even been a guest conductor with the Denver symphony orchestra.

Tommy will receive his award from Vince Dooley, director of athletics at the University of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen, Tommy Lyons, University of Georgia. (Applause)

Responding on behalf of the Silver Anniversary honorees is Tommy Lyons. Tommy.

**Thomas Lyons** (University of Georgia): Thank you all. When Coach Dooley called me to tell me of this award, I was honored, but to be honest, a bit confused. I really wasn't aware of the Silver Anniversary Award, and after learning of the nature of the honor, I was really unsure why I was selected.

After mulling this over for a few weeks and finding out about the prestigious company that I was joining in Dallas, I received another call asking me to accept the honor for this group, which includes two individuals who talk for a living and a politician. I didn't even play in a skilled position. (Laughter)

I will attempt to express our collective gratitude and some personal feelings we may share at this time. Anyone who stood on this dais to receive this type of award would be remiss not to credit those who have helped them along the way. I know that each of the recipients, all being equal in disparate backgrounds, would concur. Fortunately, I have many of those people here with me tonight, including my former coaches, family and friends. Certainly, it has been the support and faith of these people that has allowed me and each of us to come to this stage. I am sorry that my greatest teacher could not be here in person, but I am sure he is watching from a safe distance in heaven.

I have always felt that athletics in my college days in the NCAA provided me with the means to learn and to obtain an education. Most everyone would concede that education is the key to success in today's world. I believe, therefore, that this was an incredible opportunity for each and every one of us and the thousands who came before and after us. It is my belief that the reason that the six of us are on this podium is that we looked at our education as a gift, and that is the key. We have accepted this gift as a challenge to return in kind to our communities. Hopefully, we will all continue over the next 25 years the installments we have begun over the last 25. In that light, I would be remiss if I didn't give my thanks to the NCAA and to offer a challenge.

I believe that the NCAA and education are one. I would like to see this organization return to its primary goal, that is providing education to athletes. Unfortunately, today we hear more about the role of the NCAA and NCAA enforcement in negotiations versus education. Perhaps that is the problem that is seated in the localities, the win-at-all-costs mentality or the change in the goals of the athletes involved. I truly believe that colleges should select students who are athletes and not athletes who view higher education as a stumbling block in their road to a professional career. (Applause)

Education is a gift. I realize that this may be an attitude that is archaic or outmoded, but only when we are admitting individuals to our schools who have the same qualifications as the general campus population will the need for enforcement be curtailed and the goal of educa-



tion be achieved. As I stand here with these individuals and others who are being recognized, I can only be awed by the future. The challenges that each of us has been given with these gifts are gratefully accepted. We look to a stronger, smarter and healthier world, one in which our children, perhaps future student-athletes and beneficiaries of this fine organization, will grow and learn. Thank you very much. (Applause)

#### THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

**Mr. Griese:** Thank you, Tommy, and congratulations to all of the Silver Anniversary Award winners. He is an offensive player and you have smart players on offense.

Now, it is time for us to turn our attention to the focal point of each honors program, the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual. Your program includes pictures of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen who, having earned a varsity athletics award in college, has exemplified the ideals and purposes to which college athletics is dedicated. It is a distinguished group, including, as you will note, former presidents, military leaders and pioneers in space and medicine. All truly have been worthy of this recognition.

John Wooden grew up on a farm in Martinsville, Indiana, and there, at Martinsville High School, he earned all-state honors three consecutive years, each year leading his team to the state championship game. He graduated from Purdue University, and then coached and taught English at Dayton High School in Kentucky and South Bend Central High in Indiana. He served in the Navy during World War II and then returned home as athletics director and head baseball and basketball coach at Indiana State University. Two years later, in 1948, UCLA beckoned, and John Wooden answered the call.

The numbers still boggle the mind—885 victories, including one string of 88 straight at UCLA. His team won 10 NCAA championships in 12 years, including seven straight titles in 38 consecutive NCAA tournament games. And yet the real story of John Wooden lies not in the victories gained, but in the lessons learned. For in the final analysis, John Wooden was a teacher.

He taught well because he learned well. At Purdue, he was a three-time all-American who led the Boilermakers to two conference championships and the 1932 national title. He earned national "player-of-the-year" honors that year, a season in which he averaged an unheard of 12.1 points per game. In his final game, he "exploded" for 21 points, making him the Big Ten's all-time single-season scoring leader.

John's numbers in the classroom were even more impressive. An English major, he won the Big Ten Conference Merit Medal in 1932 for proficiency in scholarship and athletics. He brought that background to UCLA, and for 27 years he taught conditioning, skill and teamwork: the three blocks in his "Pyramid of Success." Six-hundred-twenty victories later, John Wooden had etched his name indelibly into college basketball history. He is the only person enshrined in the Basketball Hall of Fame as both a coach and a player.

But despite the victories, despite the championships, Wooden, the

coach, downplayed his success. Instead, he defined success as "making the effort to do the best you can." Rather than point to the championships, John Wooden points to his players' near-perfect graduation rate — the 30 former players who entered law school after playing for him, the doctors, teachers and ministers who once played for him.

It is with great pleasure that I present to you the 1996 Theodore Roosevelt Award winner, John Wooden, Purdue University. (Applause)

**John Wooden:** I would like to express my personal congratulations to all of the honorees here this evening. I was really touched and agree so much with the remarks by Dr. Lyons. I think that is really, really the way it should be.

I want to express my appreciation and gratitude to those at Purdue University who nominated me for this particular award, and the committee who saw fit that I was deserving of it. I would like to feel that I am deserving, but that would be most immodest and it would be unforgivable if I wasn't duly appreciative. I am appreciative. I thank you so much.

I also want to congratulate and thank all of you here who are the executives and people at the NCAA and those who are interested in the NCAA. I feel that an intercollegiate athletics program is very important. It is not the only thing by any means, but education is the first thing and should be the first for all of you. Athletics, I think, contributes tremendously. But if they were just for the participants, they wouldn't be worthwhile. You can get that through intramurals or many other ways. They are important for the general student body, for alumni and for the people within the community, for people who are in retail stores and so on. It gives them an outlet, something that I think they need.

I think that the program serves a definite purpose that helps all. I appreciate the nice things that were said. I would like to share with you something that maybe might help me keep things in a little better perspective than I might have otherwise.

In January 1946, I was discharged from the Navy at the end of World War II and resumed a teaching position in South Bend, Indiana, where I had been teaching prior to my enlistment in 1942. In the spring of 1946, I was invited to a neighboring city, Elkhart, to speak at a dinner that they held annually in which they honored anyone within the school system that had received any special recognition during that school year.

Do you know that 25 years later, in 1971, they still recalled that evening? I know they did because the Elkhart Daily Truth, as is the custom of the daily papers in many of the smaller communities back in my home state, would have something in there under the heading of "One Year Ago Today," "Five Years Ago Today," "10 Years Ago Today." Under 25 years ago, this little item appeared: "Elkhart officials announced today that John Wooden, English teacher/coach of South Bend Central High School, would be the principal speaker at their recognition dinner, although they had hoped to have gotten a prominent person." (Laughter) That sort of helps to get back down to earth in case you get carried away with what other people might say.



I am very proud to have been selected here. I appreciate it very much. I know I am not what I ought to be and not what I am going to be, but I am better than I used to be. It is along those lines that when I graduated from a small country grade school, my father gave me seven points. He said: "Be true to yourself; help others; make each day your masterpiece; make friendship a fine art; read good books, especially one; build a shoulder against a rainy day; and give thanks for your blessings and pray for guidance every day."

We are not alone. We are all a product of our environment, our home and those with whom we have been associated through the years. I wouldn't be here if I had not had the opportunity to go to Purdue University and have the opportunity to work with a lot of wonderful young men. I have said it before: I think that the teaching profession contributes more to the real future of our society than any other single profession. I am glad I was a teacher. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. (Applause)

**President Corrigan:** Just imagine what a treat it was for me to sit here and talk to coach Wooden for an hour. Thank you so much, coach. You always have a great message.

It is a great honor for me now to present to a man who has to be doubly proud tonight, the president of Purdue University, Steven Beering, a trophy that goes back to Purdue. Here he is between two of his best, Bob and coach Wooden.

**Steven C. Beering** (Purdue University): Thank you very much.

**Mr. Griese:** Do you feel like for a second you are sitting in a basketball locker room listening to the coach talk? No wonder they won so many games at UCLA. You are the best. I am proud to say you are a Boilermaker and I am a Boilermaker. You are a real treasure. Just keep on being yourself and speaking up. Have a great life. We are so proud of you and so happy to have you with us here this evening winning our top award.

Well, it has been a fun evening for me. I remember what a special evening this was for me when I was presented the Silver Anniversary Award three or four years ago. All of those feelings have come back to me this evening. As I said before, I am going to find some way to get some eligibility back and come back to win one of these Top VIII awards. So, if that doesn't work, maybe one of my sons will come back and I will just come and watch him. Again, I think that it is terrific that you take time out of your busy schedules to recognize these individuals, all of whom truly epitomize the values of intercollegiate athletics. I appreciate you inviting me back to share this evening with you again. Thank you very much. Godspeed and thanks for being here. (Applause)

**President Corrigan:** I told you he was going to be good and he was. He is a terrific master of ceremonies because he is a wonderful person. Bob, we know that you would never accept money for this.

**Mr. Griese:** How about that \$10 for that golf game? (Laughter)

**President Corrigan:** You make me sound like a gambler. You are terrific. In your honor, the NCAA is making a contribution to Purdue University. Thank you again for being here. I think you have done a good job. Ladies and gentlemen, give him a round of applause. (Applause)

plause)

We are going to close the evening now with Dr. William Finnan, who will offer the benediction.

#### BENEDICTION

**Mr. Finnan:** It would not be inappropriate to invite all of us to offer our thoughts and prayers in silence for the deliberations that will take place over the next several days, which have every possibility of shaping the future of academics and athletics cooperation in higher education.

I would ask you to have a moment of silent prayer as you go forth with the thought that will guide us in the next few hours. Let us pray.

Go now in peace. Serve the one who has called you boldly into the future and find your true place of service in a world that yearns for integrity and honor. Amen.

**Mr. Corrigan:** Thank you, Dr. Finnan. Thank you all for being here, and congratulations again. Good night.



# ■ General Business Session

**Monday Morning, January 8, 1996**

The general business session was called to order at 8:05 a.m., with President Eugene Corrigan presiding.

## OPENING REMARKS

**President Corrigan:** We will now call this session to order. Welcome to the first general business session of this Convention. As you are all aware, we normally do not open the morning with the general business session, but this is scheduled so that we can consider and vote on the nonfederated amendments to the membership structure legislation before moving to our division business sessions.

Please note that the consent package, which is Proposals 1 through 6, will be considered at the start of the general business session tomorrow morning. But, before we begin voting on the membership-structure proposals facing us this morning, I have a few announcements.

*[Note: Electronic voting procedures were explained.]*

We are now ready to take action on the nonfederated membership structure legislation, which consists of various sections of Proposal No. 7 as listed on page 253 of the Official Notice. The floor is now open.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

### NCAA Membership Restructuring

**Joseph N. Crowley** (University of Nevada): On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I would like to move for adoption of Proposal No. 7.

*[The motion was seconded.]*

As the delegates are aware, some sections of Proposal 7 are to be voted on this morning in this general session and others, which are divisional in nature, will be voted on later in the divisional sessions. The sections that are to be considered in this morning's general business session are those that establish the foundation and framework for the restructured Association. This foundation is the basic platform for the divisional governance legislative actions that will be considered later on today.

This legislation comes before you as a consequence of a long and serious process of negotiation and accommodation involving many people—the divisional task forces, the Oversight Committee on the NCAA Membership Structure, which I chair, the Presidents Commission and the Council, conference officials, higher education associations, the Knight Commission, and many others as well. It also has taken shape through these months with participation by all three divisions. The legislation is the result of what now amounts to nearly two years of listening to suggestions and of considering various approaches and mod-

els, seeking accommodation, and seeking compromises when necessary, and that has been often.

We are at a stage where we can consider what I believe, and speaking on behalf of many colleges that have participated in this process, to be the best plan to address the challenges that face this Association. Let me tell you what specifically you will be voting on on this occasion. The dominant, common and general sections of Proposal No. 7 establish three fundamental principles that would govern this Association under the restructuring legislation.

First, Sections 7-A, P, 7-J, T, X, CC and DD are intended and indeed do clearly establish chief executive officers and institutional chief executive officers as having ultimate authority and accountability in the governance of our Association. The second sections—7-H, I, Q, Y and 7-BB—seek to simplify the governance of the Association and allow us to do our business more efficiently. The third sections—7-B, C, D, E, F, S, U, II, JJ and KK—deal with greater federation autonomy and other major goals of the restructuring process for each of the divisions, and guarantee the resources that will be needed by those divisions to maintain their current operations and to address interdivisional issues that linger.

One of the most important sections that we will consider this morning is 7-J. That section helps again to simplify and streamline the structure of the Association and does so by creating a single Association-wide Executive Committee, a governance group. It also establishes the group that will be charged with ensuring that all of our divisions operate consistently with the basic purposes and fundamental policies and general principles of the Association. This new Executive Committee, which is comprised of chief executive officers from all three divisions, gives to each division a representative voice in the Association-wide affairs.

Later on today, of course, we will have an opportunity to consider governance plans for each of the divisions. I would urge you to support the plans prepared by each of the divisional task forces. Before there can be consideration of the divisional restructuring plans, we have to vote in favor of this one.

It is, I think, an appropriate time in our Association's history to take this major step forward. So, on behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, and lots of other folks who have come together and put this plan before you, I urge your support of Proposal No. 7.

**Judith Albino** (NCAA Presidents Commission): I am Judith Albino, chair of the Presidents Commission, and it is on behalf of the Presidents Commission that I urge this Convention to support Proposal No. 7.

As a Commission, we are committed to ensuring that the Association's reform movement continues. To advance our journey down the path of meaningful reform, it is imperative that presidents and chancellors of our institutions have the accountability in this Association that exists already on their campuses. We took the initial step of increasing presidential involvement in the Association's governance at the 1984 Convention right here in Dallas when we established the Presidents Commission. Today, a changing climate in intercollegiate



athletics again compels us to develop a new and better system that vests presidents and chancellors with unequivocal authority in the governance structure. The commitment and the dedication that I know is present in our chief executive officers and those who serve on the Presidents Commission and these restructuring activities persuade me that indeed we are ready for this next step in the evolution of our governance.

During the last few months, I have joined NCAA officers in meeting with representatives from the various higher education associations and with the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. We have reviewed the restructuring plan with each of those groups. Each has endorsed this plan and we have been most gratified by that support. They have all agreed that Proposal No. 7 represents the best opportunity for the NCAA membership to take the additional steps needed to ensure the continuing integrity and success of our intercollegiate athletics programs. I am convinced that the proposed structure builds on our strength in numbers and in diversity, while ensuring the autonomy necessary for each division to make those decisions that are critical for its membership.

I am convinced that it is time to change the way that we conduct our business in this Association. This legislation sets forth a federated structure that will streamline decision-making and place our institutional CEOs in the primary policy-making role while still providing for the full participation of professional athletics administrators and academic personnel in those issues that are most relevant to their work.

I also believe that the new structure will provide greater opportunity for women and ethnic minorities, greater opportunities than we experience even today. This is the right plan at the right time for the NCAA. So, it is on behalf of the Presidents Commission that I urge your support of Proposal No. 7.

**Tanya Yvette Hughes** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Arizona): The immediate concern within the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is its role within the new structure. It appears that at the Division I Council level our input into the legislative process will be vastly reduced. We do note, however, that the voting members of Divisions II and III remain intact due to the one-school, one-vote decision. We strongly believe that direct access to the Council is essential in accomplishing the goals of this committee.

We have three major goals for this year: (1) Working to ensure that the student-athlete's voice is incorporated effectively in a restructured Association; (2) developing a communications plan for a student-athlete network that connects campus committees, conference committees and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee at the national level; and (3) working to achieve that increases in student-athletes' benefits be broad-based and inclusive, effective in all divisions.

Since 1989, when the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee was created, we have made great strides in incorporating this voice into the legislative process. We need to ensure that this continues. Last evening, our executive director said that student-athletes' welfare was the key issue facing athletics today. In order to effectively meet the needs of student-athletes, you must know personally what they

are. This can only be accomplished if we are a part of this decision-making process. Thank you.

**Prentice Gault** (Big Eight Conference): On behalf of the Oversight Committee on the NCAA Membership Structure, I urge you to support Proposal No. 7. The oversight committee has worked together as a group to develop a plan that benefits all three divisions. Divisional boundaries were set aside and compromises we've reached over rather complex and difficult issues. All of the guarantees set forth by Proposal No. 7-F are examples of how the oversight committee and the Presidents Commission have sought affirmation for all three divisions.

Three constitutionally protected guarantees are intended to provide each division with the programs and resources it needs to address issues unique to its membership. As President Crowley noted, an important part of the legislation that we are considering during this morning's general business session is the greater federation this restructuring plan sets forth. For the first time, each division will have independent governing groups to discuss, consider and act on issues specific to the division. It is no secret that each division in the NCAA is distinctly different from the others. Our divisional structure was created in the 1970s to group institutions with comparable athletics programs and similar commitments to such programs. Each division's membership has needs that are different than schools in other divisions. This new system should allow these needs to be addressed in a timely and efficient way.

As you know, this plan does not call for the creation of separate NCAAAs. Instead, it is a plan that simply is the best to entrust decision-making authority with the leadership in each division. This will permit each division to operate independent of the others and to address the needs of its membership. However, each division must act consistently with the basic purposes from those policies and general principles as set forth in the Association's constitution.

The proposed Executive Committee will serve as the light tower to ensure that the principles that bring us together as an Association remain the guiding light for all three divisions. You have to be excited as we anticipate the opportunities that this plan creates for each division. Be confident. This plan provides each division with the governance system that it needs to ensure its success. On behalf of the oversight committee, I urge your support for Proposal No. 7.

**Edward B. Fort** (North Carolina A&T State University): On this occasion, I rise for the purpose of supporting the motion made by Joe Crowley and endorsed by Judith Albino. At the same time, I would urge, as we take under advisement the necessities that are associated with getting on with the matter of changing the governance structure through federation, that during the course of the 15- to 18-month time period that is devoted to transition, that the following new options be taken under advisement, assuming this motion passes.

Number one, the proposal makes references to the issue of the constitutionality associated with the issue of diversity. There is a reference to the same thing on page 12 of the Convention Official Notice as it is related to the assurances that there will be gender and ethnicity diversification as it pertains to the composition of the Executive Com-



mittees, the Management Council and the Board of Directors. Then, finally, it is my hope and anticipation that in concert with the narrative contained on page 48 of Proposal No. 9, that the body will see fit to make use of two very key important phrases or words that are contained in the "Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved" section of Proposal 9.

First, the one that pertains to the issue of goals, and secondly, and most important, that which pertains to the development and operationalizing of a plan. The hope is, therefore, as Proposal 7 is endorsed and then made ready for actualization in concert with the work of the transition team, that they will strongly take under advisement the worthwhileness of including as a benchmark those two indices, particularly as it pertains to the issue of a plan.

If that occurs, and I feel quite certain and hopeful that it will, we will have made a very gigantic and large step forward as it pertains to the workability of Proposal No. 7. On that basis, I strongly support and urge the passage of No. 7. Thank you.

**Edward H. Hammond** (Fort Hays State University): I rise in opposition to the proposal on the floor that we have heard described as the "most critical vote in the history of this Association."

I wholeheartedly agree, because it very well may be the last vote that this group takes as a body in terms of future direction of the NCAA. If you look at the proposal, I wholeheartedly support the efforts to simplify, to provide presidential controls, to guarantee one Association, and I am in full support of the federation. I am not a supporter of abdicating our rights to participate in the future developments of the Association. I direct your attention to the Executive Committee that Prentice Gautt called the "light tower" of the Association. I think that very well could be the "control tower" of the Association. Not only does it have full budget authority, it will provide the strategic planning for the Association. It will identify the core issues. I direct your attention to page 10. If you have not read it before you vote, I wholeheartedly recommend that you read pages nine and 10 of the Notice. It not only identifies those core issues, but the Executive Committee is charged under this proposed change in our constitution to act on behalf of you and can decide whether to submit anything to you in the future on any of these core issues.

It also has full authority regarding constitutional change. So this may be the last time that this whole body will need to vote on the constitution of this organization. It has the authority to call an annual meeting or special meeting. I have been told, in asking questions, that that was a mistake, that the annual meeting will still be called by constitution. That is what it says now and that is what you are voting on. Look at the organizational bodies for federation. You will find them on page 14 under "Responsibilities and Duties of Division II Presidents Council." That is the group that will run Division II on our behalf and develop our procedures. Read the first charge of the responsibility under Division II. We are to, "implement the policies adopted by the Association's Executive Committee." So whatever they adopt, we are then responsible to implement. You will find the same wording under the Presidents Council in Division III.

But if you go back and you look under the governance group of Divi-

sion I, you will find no such wording. Why? If you look at the makeup of the Executive Committee, you will find the answer to that. It may have been a mistake, but I believe that it is also kind of realistic when you look at the fact that of the 16 voting members in the Executive Committee, eight of them go to Division I, two of them go to Division I-AA and two of them go to Division I-AAA. Only two go to Division II and only two go to Division III.

Ladies and gentlemen, voting for this now is basically turning your Association over to an Executive Committee that is not representative of our organization. You all know of the vast numbers of institutions in Division I and Division II. Division I-AA doesn't even have close to the same number of members that Division III does. I mean, it is about four times, yet it has the same representation. Yet, this is going to be the "control tower" of our Association. From this point on, once you cast this vote and this change in the constitution takes place, you are not going to be able to go back and create a Presidents Commission if you want to, unless the Executive Committee wants it to occur. You are not going to be able to bring about change in reform unless the Executive Committee wants it to be brought about, because they are going to control the agenda, call all of the meetings and the other things that run this Association. That is the bottom line.

I have been told by a number of people, "Ed, why don't you get smart? The train has left the station and everything is on its way." That very well could be the case. Ladies and gentlemen, I think this is the most important vote in the history of this Association. The vast majority of these changes are positive, but the power that is in effect placed in the Executive Committee is too much power for one particular division. In fact, coming down here, I was reading USA Today. Some of you may have seen it as well. In the paper, an athletics director in a Division I institution says, "I worry about some of the power aspects. I am not sure it is right."

I think that athletics director was correct. It is up to you to cast your vote, because this Association belongs to each and every one of us. We are going to cast a "no" vote. Thank you.

**Rev. James N. Loughran** (St. Peter's College): This is one occasion where I would rather be in an NCAA Convention than at home.

Prior to this, I have struggled with issues of big-time athletics as president of Loyola Marymount in Los Angeles, Brooklyn College and Mount St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, Maryland. Yesterday and today, I hear our leaders, Judith Albino and Ced Dempsey, for example, plead with us to pass Proposal No. 7. They say it will be a turning point in the history of the NCAA and college sports, that our reforms will finally be possible. From my own experience, I am skeptical. If you study the history of the NCAA and the big time sports in Walter Byers' recent book, the one lesson to be learned, it seems, is that reform is impossible.

Why? Because Division I colleges are caught between irreconcilable objectives—amateurism and academic integrity on the one hand, big business and profits on the other. Corruption, greed and antiacademic forces only worsen as college sports become more and more big time. You can't reform what can't be reformed. Nevertheless, I recommend that we vote for Proposal No. 7, not to reform things, but to change



them profoundly, to choose for or against professionalism and money making, to get us out of the hypocracies that exist now with no compromises.

Let's see what carefully chosen presidents, leaders of American higher education out front and in charge, can do. Let's give them our support.

**John A. Hogan** (Colorado School of Mines): While I support and agree with some of the concerns expressed by President Hammond, I can support Proposal No. 7.

But I have other concerns. I listened with interest yesterday to Executive Director Dempsey, who talked about values and said values are at risk. I was concerned that the message is being sent to many student-athletes that sports is a full-time job in-season. He talked about the pressures that student-athletes feel because of the emphasis on winning, which means money. While money is a concern, it should not be the number one priority of this Association. The number one priority must be students, particularly students in the classroom. The decision-making process in the NCAA should begin with the classroom and move toward the stadium. It should not move from the stadium to the classroom, because the classroom will be forgotten in that process. While CEOs and ADs certainly are concerned and qualified, professors are best qualified to speak for the students in the classroom and laboratory.

Therefore, one of my concerns that I see in the restructuring process is that the voice of students in the classroom represented by faculty members is going to be very quiet, if heard at all. So, my concern is that in general, policy-making tribunals must come from men and women on campus who deal with students each day. That representation should be equally balanced between CEOs, ADs and faculty members forming a governance triad. Off-campus entities are not the appropriate bodies to be making policy decisions that affect students and institutions.

So, my concern is that in the restructuring, the perspective of students in the classroom should be represented equally by faculty members. If I could feel confident that that would happen, I would vote for No. 7. Thank you.

**John A. DiBiaggio** (Tufts University): As a proud member of the Knight Commission and as an individual who has had the privilege of serving as president of two Division I institutions and currently a Division III institution, I would urge this Convention to not only pass this resolution but to do so overwhelmingly.

I do believe that it provides the best mechanisms for us to address the challenges that we currently face in intercollegiate athletics. It is not a panacea, it is not perfect; indeed, what it depends upon, is the integrity of the individual institutions, as has always been the case no matter what action we take at these meetings. But also it depends upon, of course, the leadership that has been selected.

I am confident that the presidents who will be represented on the Executive Committee will take into account the concerns of all aspects of this body and will act appropriately. I think that we must send a powerful message to everyone that we are prepared now to address ag-

gressively some of the problems that confront us. Indeed, I hope that this Convention votes for this proposal and does so in a fashion that sends a message that we are prepared to do so. Thank you.

**Christine H. B. Grant** (University of Iowa): I would like to make two comments about this proposal.

One, most people who have spoken believe this restructuring proposal is far down the field. Yesterday, I noted in a very recent magazine that a significant number of athletics directors do not agree with this proposal. In these Division I meetings, almost one-fourth of the athletics directors do not support it. What is surprising or perhaps astonishing is that almost no one is willing to be against it. In a democracy, this reluctance to speak up for a belief is very concerning. Surely, we owe it to ourselves and educators and our student-athletes to honestly and openly debate an issue that will massively change our organization.

Two, 62 percent of the athletics directors responding to the Athletic Business surveys do not agree with the basic premise on which the restructuring has been built. That is, that those institutions with the greatest financial and competitive equity should command the decision-making power and that others not be disenfranchised. Why? If the NCAA was not an organization but professional sports, I would heartily endorse this move of acceptance on an economic premise. But the NCAA is not a professional organization. We are universities running educational sports programs for students.

Three, yes, we must have presidential control of athletics. Don't we already have all the elements in place in our organization to ensure that? The presidents have the opportunity to be here in person and to cast their votes. The Commission could require that all votes be recorded through an electronic voting system, ensuring that the CEOs can hold their representatives accountable for votes. It is an excellent check and balance system.

Four, while the representative forum of a democracy is acceptable when a participatory democracy is not possible, there is no question in my mind that a participatory democracy is preferable even though it is slower than one division. Selective wisdom should also be more important than speed of positions. In our particular situation, could each division have a great deal of autonomy already? There is no need to move away from this democracy. I urge you to reject the restructuring proposal.

If this passes, I urge each of us to permit ourselves, in Division I especially, to reaffirm the viability of the one institution, one-vote approach, which has served us so well for almost 100 years.

**Kenneth J. Weller** (Central College, Iowa): I rise to speak in support of the motion. I have, likewise, been a member of the Knight Commission as has my good friend, John DiBiaggio. I was also a member of the original Presidents Commission representing the membership of Division III.

Recently, I had an opportunity to write an article for The NCAA News. In that article, I expressed concerns. I support the proposition, but I have concerns about the details. As I said, the devil is often in the details. I urge you to vote for the proposition today, and particular-



ly I urge my colleagues in Division III to vote for this proposition. I think that we have a solid, basic structure. It will only work if we make it work. As far as presidential responsibility and authority is concerned, that will only occur if the athletics directors, the coaches and all parts of this organization support the presidents. So, the first part, it is extremely important to have presidential authority and responsibility, which will only come with your support.

The second part—federation—is a little more difficult. I have spoken on this floor before, not terribly eloquently, but I talked about that “C” up there in the NCAA that speaks to “collegiate,” not professionalism. I called that “C” the tie that bonds us together. I will change that “C” to core. There are core values and my deep concern is that in the next 18 months, having, I hope, voted for this proposition, we will maintain the “C,” the core, the collegiate. Let’s make absolutely certain that the committee structure that is changed in this organization will have nonfederated membership so that the wisdom and the education of so many people who have served in so many different divisions and levels will have a chance.

I trust the leadership of this organization. I have worked with colleagues in Divisions III, in II and in I. I have found them to be a lot like me. We think the same way, not always on every issue. But I think integrity is there. I believe that this sets the stage for us to have an expert organization. I don’t really believe that at this time that we have any other choice. So, I urge you to vote for the proposition, and if the proposition passes, then make sure in the next 18 months that you keep the pressure on to see that some of the important details are filled in properly. Thank you.

**Adam W. Herbert** (University of North Florida): I am a member of the Presidents Commission and have had the opportunity to serve as cochair of the Division II task force that was working on this restructuring issue.

I do rise in support of the proposal. I just wanted to state two observations. One is related to the concerns expressed by President Hammond relative to the Division II Presidents Council and the Management Council. One of the things that we were very concerned about in our division, and I am sure it was the case with others, was that we wanted greater control over our own affairs. I can tell you without question, we are convinced that the plan before us does provide the kind of control over Division II matters we regarded as being essential for the future of this Association. Our presidents will have control over general policy and the budget, strategic planning, and those types of issues. Our Management Council clearly does have control over the operations of our divisional affairs. A major concern that he raised relates to the Executive Committee. I think it is very important for everyone to understand that the Divisions II and III task forces felt very, very strongly about having an Executive Committee. We were also convinced that it was absolutely essential that this committee be a strong one.

In an organization with the level of federation that we have in this proposal, if we are serious about maintaining an Association, we must have a strong Executive Committee that is able to focus on those com-

mon themes and values that make us an Association.

So, we argue very strongly for this. We are convinced—as is the Division I task force—that this was essential. I think it is worth noting that the Presidents Commission was unanimous. Certainly, in the context of Division II, our presidents were unanimous in feeling that this was important. We were not worried about the powers that are set forth here because we are convinced that as we go forward, we can deal with those issues that bind us. We cannot focus on the major challenges that are going to confront our organization in the next decade and beyond if we don’t have a mechanism for focusing attention or demanding action where appropriate. As a consequence, we think this proposal is one that is very sound.

I again strongly support it, as do my colleagues. We are convinced that this is going to provide a significant opportunity for all of our member associations to work closely together on common issues and simultaneously pursue our own destinies to build the kind of quality programs that we want to have in each of our divisions. Thank you, Mr. President.

**M. James Bensen** (Bemidji State University): I am representing the presidents of the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference. I am voting in favor of restructuring and encourage those who are here today to participate similarly in a proactive way. As a CEO, I am delighted to have all these developmental functions of the NCAA placed in our care. It is our responsibility and central to our functional roles that we have on our individual campuses. I would like to commend those who crafted the legislation to ensure the guarantees that are outlined on page eight—the guarantee of budget allocation, the guarantee of access to national championships, the guarantee of membership services and the guarantee of special programs.

The opportunity to design our destiny by division through federation will allow us to create athletics programs that best suit our institutions and our student-athletes. It is important, it is essential and, in fact, it is imperative. By passing Proposal No. 7, we take the position of trust that we can and we will create an Association that will boldly move ahead with a streamlined and effective governance structure to address a rapidly changing tomorrow. Thank you.

**Mr. Crowley:** If I may, Mr. President, I would like to briefly address a few of the concerns that have been raised in the course of the discussion this morning. Tanya and Chancellor Fort and the gentleman from the Colorado School of Mines all addressed the important issues, issues of access to the new structure.

I would like to assure them all that these questions did arise in the course of our many discussions. They are regarded as very consequential questions and they will need to be further addressed during the course of our further discussions in the year or 18 months to come before the structure is implemented, if it is passed this morning. The role of the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is a very important role. Obviously, how that role will be handled in the new structure is a very important question, and again, one that would need to be addressed during the transition. I can assure members of that committee and others interested in matters of access for student-athletes through



the governance structure of this Association that there is every intention of assuring that that role, important as it has been to date, will be enhanced in the new structure.

As Chancellor Fort noted, there are provisions in the legislation, along with Resolution 9, which will be acted upon later, that will help us get down toward ensuring greater representation for women and minorities in the structure. As far as the role of faculty athletics representatives is concerned, that has been a question much on the minds of many people. There is provision for that role to be there in this new structure. It is not possible at this point to say specifically how many faculty athletics representatives may sit on the Management Council, but it certainly is not anybody's intention that in this new structure that that role will be in any way lessened over what it is now. Again, that is a matter to be dealt with in the transition.

As Jim Whalen said, there are details in which the devil can reside and there is consciousness on the part of all of us who have worked in this process that these details will need to be dealt with as we move forward during the course of the coming year.

President Herbert has commented upon the concerns expressed by President Hammond regarding the Executive Committee and its role. I believe that interpretation is simply inaccurate. In the event the Executive Committee is not going to exercise the kind of authority that President Hammond's interpretation would give it, indeed, as President Herbert pointed out, that Executive Committee is there with the kind of authority that is Association-wide at the instigation of the representatives of Division II and Division III on the oversight committee, as well as in the Presidents Commission and in the Council.

Finally, with regard to the point that was made with respect to whether or not it is appropriate to have honest and open debate over this restructuring business of ours, the best testimony that I could think of as to the presence of that honest and open debate is the two years of discussion that we have given to this subject, the many, many changes that have occurred along the way. Nobody's voice was quieted during the course of this process, nor should anyone's voice be quieted this morning as we vote on this process. I believe that we have come to the end of this debate. I believe we have incorporated a number of views by a number of representatives of all of our divisions and constituencies, that we have put before you a plan that represents the best possible plan that we could put before you at this stage. I would again encourage your support of Proposal No. 7.

**Mr. Hammond:** I appreciate the comments regarding addressing our concerns. Some of us, I guess, worry about devils more than others. When and how would the constitution of this organization be changed if it were desired that some of the things that we are voting on today need to be changed?

I notice this doesn't go into effect until August 1997. Does that mean at the Convention next year, in January 1997, that if the membership wishes to change the direction of this legislation that we would have the ability to do so under the current constitution and bylaws?

**Mr. Crowley:** The question that you raise, President Hammond, is capable of being addressed in a couple of ways. That could be handled

at the 1997 Convention if there is a desire for changes affecting the changes that you have expressed regarding the constitution. As for constitutional changes in the future, should there be a desire to make them, I believe that the structure does allow for that. The Executive Committee, it is true, would call for the constitutional Convention. But if there is a desire for constitutional change that emanates from the divisions, I believe that desire would be manifested at the level of the Executive Committee and that could be accommodated without trauma.

**Mr. Hammond:** If I understand the answer correctly, under what we are voting on today, the divisions through their governance structure would be able to propose constitutional changes that would be voted on by the membership. That is what I understood the answer to be.

**President Corrigan:** I think for next year, the answer to that is "yes." That is one institution and one vote, is it not, Joe?

**Mr. Crowley:** That is correct. But in addition to and beyond that, should this new structure pass, the point that I was seeking to make is that in calling a Convention that would deal with the constitutional matters in the future, that the initiative could be at the level of the division moving forward from there to the Executive Committees, which could, when that Convention is called, provide that there be discussion of these constitutional matters.

**Mr. Hammond:** Thank you.

**Yvonne L. Slatton** (University of Iowa): I first have a procedural question and then a quick comment. Are we going to vote on the amendments before we vote on this main motion, or are the amendments moot?

**President Corrigan:** The original vote will be on 7-A, B, D, H, I, Q, S, T, U, X, Y, BB, CC, DD and II; and all the dominant provisions, except F and J, which have amendments.

**Ms. Slatton:** So the amendment will come up in reference to those two?

**President Corrigan:** That is correct.

**Ms. Slatton:** Thank you. My only comment—I think all the comments have been made about the concerns—is that I was interested in President Whalen's weighted comments this morning. I was impressed with the concerns he raised in *The NCAA News*.

I think that many of us are concerned with the slip in values, from educational values to corporate economic values. I think that in this restructuring plan it makes that shift. It formalizes that shift. If we are ready to do that as an organization, I think we need to say that publicly. We should be honest with ourselves, as well as our constituencies, that we have moved from basic educational values to basic economic values. I was struck last night by our honoree who pleaded with us to recover our educational values; that the general public, the media and all the corporate interests have taken over intercollegiate athletics in a way that concerns many of us.

I know this is true in higher education in general. As members of higher education, we know that we are all caught in the economic struggle. I just urge us, if we pass this restructuring plan, to recognize



that significant shift in values. It will be much harder to save our core values as educational values.

**President Corrigan:** Thank you. I think we are ready for the vote. This is all the dominant provisions, with the exception of 7-F and 7-J.

[Parts A, B, D, H, I, Q, S, T, U, X, Y, BB, CC, DD, and II of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) were adopted, 779-79-1.]

**Thomas Gallagher** (New York Collegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal 7-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

First off, we would like on behalf of our conference to commend the committee for the onerous task they have performed in publishing the proposal that was presented and voted on and passed this morning.

Amendment 7-1 is a clarifying one. It defines the intent of the parties that have developed the restructuring proposal. It defines general operating revenues as it is used in Bylaw 4.01.2.1.1 to include in the future those revenues that exist today, including any modifications, extensions or successor contracts for such services.

We urge the group to approve this because it does clarify the intent of the parties who developed the restructuring proposal and it does ensure that as a minimum those revenues that are included today will be continued in the future.

**Phyllis L. Howlett** (Big Ten Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Executive Committee, I urge your support of Proposal 7-1. As the chair of the Budget Subcommittee of the Executive Committee, I have had an opportunity to review the effects and the impact of Proposal 7-1.

I believe that this amendment accurately reflects the agreement reached among the three divisional task forces regarding the definition of the Association's general operating revenues for purposes of the restructuring. At our December meeting in Kansas City, the Executive Committee agreed to support this amendment. On behalf of the Executive Committee, I urge your support of 7-1.

**Lynn Dorn** (North Dakota State University): On behalf of the Council and the Presidents Commission, I wish to inform the assembly that both of those groups are supporting Proposal 7-1. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 7-1 (Page A-38) was adopted, 829-10-3.]

[Part F of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) was adopted as amended by No. 7-1, 755-13.]

**Kenneth A. Shaw** (Syracuse University): It is my pleasure to move the adoption of Proposal No. 7-14.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Presidents Commission unanimously agrees to edit its current legislative proposal to delete the Executive Committee alternate process, as set forth in Proposal No. 7-J. The representatives on the Commission from all three divisions agree that this issue did not receive appropriate attention during the past year's negotiation sessions.

This issue is the kind of detail that the restructuring transition teams are being asked to review during the upcoming year for possible legislation at the 1997 NCAA Convention. Therefore, your vote in favor of Proposal No. 7-14 will allow the sponsors and supporters of No. 7-4 to agree to the Commission's desire that all alternate issues be

studied during the next year. On behalf of the Presidents Commission and the Council, I urge your support for No. 7-14.

[Proposal No. 7-14 (Page A-49) was adopted, 762-30-6.]

[Part J of Proposal No. 7 (Page A-7) was adopted as amended by No. 7-14, 784-30-4. Parts C, E and JJ were adopted (Division I, 320-6-1; Division II, 233-5-1; Division III, 281-14-1). Part KK was adopted, 733-14-1.]

**President Corrigan:** This concludes our legislative actions this morning. We will be back here at four this afternoon. At the beginning of that session, we will open the window of reconsideration for legislative actions taken in your division business sessions. We will then complete the legislative actions scheduled for Presidential Agenda Day. We are in recess until 4 o'clock this afternoon for the general business session.

[The general business session was recessed at 9:45 a.m.]

## Monday Afternoon, January 8, 1996

The general business session was called to order at 4 p.m., with President Corrigan presiding.

### OPENING REMARKS

**President Corrigan:** Let me welcome you back to the final session for today. We will use this afternoon's session to vote on the remaining nonfederated legislation that is scheduled for Presidential Agenda Day and the remaining Division I Presidential Agenda Day items. The consent package will be considered at tomorrow's general business session. We are distributing a listing of all the voting actions for the division business sessions held earlier today. Those actions stand unless they are reconsidered or rescinded during this session in what we term the "window of reconsideration." That window is now open. Please remember that if you wish to move for reconsideration of an action, you must have voted on the prevailing side.

### RECONSIDERATION OF VOTING ACTION

#### Reconsideration of Partial-Qualifier—Division I

**Patricia A. Sullivan** (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): Having voted on the prevailing side of Proposal No. 19, and in view of the narrowness of the vote on this proposal and with the understanding that next year's Convention is a legislative Convention including all members, I will request reconsideration of Proposal No. 19. Thank you.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Edward B. Fort** (North Carolina A&T State University): I would like to acknowledge with gratification the actions taken by Dr. Sullivan, the distinguished chancellor at UNCG.

As a follow-up to that motion, we request that we have a reconsideration of the vote on No. 19. I think, Mr. President, the basic problem that we have here, which is one that borders on maybe even gross insufficiency, is this. It is something almost incongruous about a circum-



stance wherein "Youngster A," who qualifies under the current rules but come August of 1996 will not qualify under No. 16, would at least gain the stop on a partial-qualification status under No. 19. That is the bottom line.

How can we really afford to eliminate that youngster's chance to get a crack at the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow if under the current rules he or she does qualify? We have eliminated them under No. 16, but at least gained some kind of access to that goal marker by getting down inside the gate if 19 becomes a reality.

As the eloquent speaker earlier today from Rice University indicated, let's put the burden of proof on the youngsters and see whether or not they can produce. I have enough faith as one chancellor in the reality, that I think they can, by golly. Let's try to see if that works. Incidentally, we would be willing, or I would be willing personally, to present as editorial language next year the suggestiveness of a sunset proviso as it pertains to how long No. 19, if passed, would last, such as two years. That is our position. Thank you.

**Roderic B. Park** (University of Colorado, Boulder): I rise to speak against Proposal No. 19. This proposal, contrary to what has been said here today, is backsliding.

There are two directions that this body has taken over the vote today and over the past several years that would seem to be totally inconsistent with the passage of Proposal No. 19. First, is the thoughtful and extensive debate that preceded the passing of Proposal No. 16. I assume everybody in here knew what they were doing when Proposal No. 16 was passed. We were raising the standards. That obviously meant that certain people were going to fall below the threshold. There is no way of raising standards without having that happen.

Secondly, today this body passed the restructuring legislation. Part of what that means is that the CEOs and the presidents have a greater say in the oversight and what goes on in the NCAA. I doubt that if this oversight for most of us would mean lowering academic standards. To me, it is totally inconsistent to now reverse these two actions—the passage of Proposal 16 and the restructuring by lowering standards back toward Proposition 48. I strongly urge this body not only to maintain, but reinforce, its vote of this afternoon and reject Proposal No. 19.

**Robert H. Donaldson** (University of Tulsa): For the past dozen years, I have heeded the calling of the Presidents Commission for university presidents to come to these meetings to ensure their institution's commitment and movement for reform of intercollegiate athletics.

Sitting in these meetings has not always been the most stimulating or the most amusing way for me to spend my time, but I thought the investment worthwhile given the results, particularly in the realm of implementing higher academic standards for student-athletes. Maintaining progress has required a good bit of vigilance, however, because every year there have been efforts to gut the previous year's results. I was disappointed that the Presidents Commission inexplicably shifted its stance on Proposal No. 19 from opposition to neutrality. This newest attempt, it seems to me, to gut reform clearly wouldn't be

neutral for the headline writers. They would have seen it very clearly: "NCAA Rolls Back Higher Standards." This Convention held fast in its wisdom and voted Proposal No. 19 down.

Let's not reconsider it. Let's not jeopardize many years of investment in the process. Let's let the headline read instead: "NCAA Keeps its Commitment to Reform." Thank you.

**David Goldfield** (University of North Carolina, Charlotte): I am the faculty athletics representative from the University of North Carolina, Charlotte. I rise in opposition to reconsideration of Proposal 19.

The NCAA and Proposal 16 do not ruin any chances of students to enter universities. This is not a minority issue. This is an issue of academic standards and the standards that we have been setting for this Association for the past half decade. It is an issue of improving the opportunities and chances of student-athletes to complete their degrees instead of being discouraged and discarded. While we are on the subject of minorities, why is it that whenever we discuss academic requirements, it becomes a minority issue?

What are we saying? That African-American youngsters cannot compete academically with other students? Why do we expect failure of African-American youngsters? Instead, why don't we say "yes, they can, they are as good as anyone and everyone." If we raise expectations, I am convinced African-American youngsters will meet these expectations. Thank you.

**Khalid Channell** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of California, Irvine): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly supports the reconsideration of Proposal No. 19.

I agree that Proposal 19 would elevate the student-athletes who have been considered as nonqualifiers if the legislation will take effect August 1 of this year to partial-qualifier status. Partial qualifiers have historically competed in higher education and inherently it will penalize one group of students for not passing this legislation. I had the unique experience of receiving my high-school education from both the city of South Central Los Angeles and in the affluent suburb of an area in one of the outlying counties. I believe that no one would argue that a secondary education is equal across the board. It is equally naive to assume that anyone should be able to achieve qualifier status when the disparity in education is viewed in a reasonable light. We see the need for more minority role models. Is there any better role model than a struggling high-school student who gets an opportunity to successfully complete the rigors of collegiate academics in athletics? The answer is obvious. So, again, the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges this body to vote in support of Proposal No. 19.

**Norman Chervany** (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): I speak for reconsideration, and when that passes, for the passage of Proposal 19. Ask yourselves the question: "Why do we have the partial-qualifier category?" It seems to me that it exists because there are some student-athletes who fall in that gray area between a record that clearly indicates they should succeed and a record that indicates they will not succeed or likely not succeed.

We want to give these students a chance to come to the university, to affiliate with the team, to prove they can succeed by improving their



skills and ultimately to graduate. That is why we have a partial-qualifier category. But if we look at the reality of the partial qualifier as it now is defined, it is practically the null set. In a study of approximately 1,000 recruited students in our university's history, one student out of 1,000 recruited—not necessarily signed, but 1,000 recruited students—has that rare combination of a test score below 700, yet a GPA of over 2.500.

We should not use the existence of this practically null set of partial qualifiers to ease our conscience and to say there are not some gray decision areas with which we should focus on the student and let them come in and prove themselves rather than saying, "no, you cannot come, you cannot make it."

I urge reconsideration and I urge the passage of Proposal No. 19.

**Alex Wood** (Black Coaches Association): I rise to the microphone for reconsideration of No. 19 and a favorable vote for No. 19.

In response to some of my colleagues, in terms of African-Americans' ability to learn and compete academically, it is without question that our youngsters can compete academically when given equal resources. Yet, we all know that in the real world that it is not a level playing field throughout this country. We still have pockets of poverty, if you will, and kids who are socio-economically deprived. That is one reason why we are strongly urging the reconsideration of No. 19. There is a good number of kids who would fall through the cracks and through the holes of this legislation.

No. 16 is not thorough. I don't believe that No. 16 was thoroughly thought through when it was considered. I believe No. 19 again addresses more of the issues as it relates to African-American student-athletes and it provides more access to higher education for African-American student-athletes. Again, I think that we need to look closer at this legislation. I think we need to consider strongly reconsidering it and voting for it. It is unconscionable in my mind that we can sit here today and actually vote against this legislation.

Now, 47 percent of college athletics today is African-American. Forty-five percent of these "Prop 48" kids who went to school graduated. I think there is overwhelming evidence that kids can achieve. They can compete when given the opportunity to get to that level and not be denied.

Again, we have some projections here today about what kids may or may not be able to do once they enter college. Well, obviously, if you don't pass No. 19, or something similar, we will never find out. Thank you, sir.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 19 (Page A-75) was adopted, 176-155.]

**President Corrigan:** With the results of the reconsideration of Proposal No. 19, we are now to the motion. Unless someone has some new grounds to plow, I don't want to stop anyone from heading to a microphone.

**Thomas K. Hearn Jr.** (Wake Forest University): I believe all has been said. I think before the final vote is cast, it is well for us to decide whether we are prepared to have the total impact of Proposal 16 to be the two additional forces.

Under this proposal, all student-athletes will be allowed to receive financial aid if they practice as freshmen. It will be just like "Prop 48," with no additions except these two courses. Is that what we really want? When you raise standards, there are consequences. Somehow we are willing more easily to raise the standards than we are to face the consequences. Our young people will live up to the standards, however high we set them. If we are willing to set it high, they will attain that.

[Proposal No. 19 (Page A-75) was defeated upon reconsideration by Division I, 161-163-6.]

#### **Reconsideration of Financial Aid—Summer School—Division I**

**William T. "Todd" Turner** (North Carolina State University): Having voted on the prevailing side, we ask for reconsideration of Proposal No. 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Robert Bowlsby** (University of Iowa): This morning when the I-A membership considered Proposal No. 34, it was noteworthy that a very minimal amount of discussion occurred considering the significance of the amendment. As indicated by the vote—58-51-6—there is a substantial degree of disagreement regarding this dramatic departure from current financial aid practices.

It is my opinion that there are many in the room who have had second thoughts regarding the impact of Proposal No. 34. While the sponsors of this proposal describe the concept as permissive legislation, this is a classic example of how the maximum becomes the minimum in our Association. With the passage of No. 34, we will quickly have virtually all of our basketball and football players on campus as soon as they graduate from high school. Presumably, we will have an equal number of female student-athletes. While they are on campus, we will feed, house and shepherd our young people throughout the summer. We will soon have full strength and conditioning programs, full academic-support operations and, in a general sense, a much larger student-services program than in a typical summer session. Although there are elements of this proposal that contribute to social transition, there is also a long list of negative byproducts in which all of us will be forced by competitive considerations to participate.

I urge you to vote "yes" on the motion to reconsider and to vote "no" on Proposal No. 34. I further encourage the sponsors to return with a proposal that addresses some of these concerns that are not addressed within the current amendment and let us look at it on that basis. Thank you.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 34 (Page A-101) was adopted, 69-22.]

**President Corrigan:** Are there any other items for reconsideration in Division I, or in any division? That is good news. That being the case, we have just closed the window of reconsideration. That is worthy of a small hand. (Applause) The parliamentarian almost hit me over the head.

Is there any further discussion on Proposal No. 34?

**Fred Gruninger** (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): I have a  
General Business Session



question on clarification of the effective date on No. 34. Maybe someone on the Council or one of the sponsors could define August 1, 1996, in relationship to the different summer schools beginning at different institutions. Does this mean that summer school, or do we delay it until 1997?

**President Corrigan:** Not for any term that begins before August 1, 1996.

**Mr. Gruninger:** I just call that to the membership's attention. You have different summer school configurations, which certainly allow those schools that begin after August in the summer session to have an advantage in relationship to those summer sessions that start prior to that.

**Mr. Bowlsby:** I have just a couple more comments on the question itself. I think that we ought to take a long, hard look before we begin to jump off as an Association into requiring basically young people to report to our campuses immediately after they finish their high-school year.

I think there is a tremendous implication about summer jobs. It varies, for instance, very significantly depending upon whether you are in a relative rural area or whether you are in an urban area where there may be lots of opportunities for summer jobs.

I think there are a whole lot of implications to this proposal that have not been thoroughly considered or thoroughly thought through. I would just like to see a more comprehensive project come forward, one that addresses these things and one that gives a little more uniformity and a little more consideration to some of the downsides. I think it is obvious to all of us that there are some very significant upsides to this proposal that in some fashion will be advantageous to advance at some point in time. I think it is a mistake to move forward with this proposal without these things being taken into consideration. Thank you.

**William H. Harris** (Alabama State University): Why is this proposal for Division I-A only when the provision it covers is for Division I institutions?

**President Corrigan:** It will be voted on by the entire Division I other than Division I-A. This came up in the I-A meeting. It passed in there and then the next time it is voted on it will be voted on by I-AA and I-AAA.

**Mr. Harris:** This vote is just to concern whether or not it comes as a recommendation from Division I-A?

**President Corrigan:** Yes, Division I-A.

**William V. Muse** (Auburn University): I would like to speak in favor of Proposal No. 34 and to point out that the provision does not increase the numbers of summer support that a student-athlete can receive. It would simply allow that student-athlete to use the summer prior to the freshman year to get better adjusted to the campus and the academic environment prior to the beginning of that first season of intercollegiate competition. We think that will help prepare the student better academically than the present situation.

[Proposal No. 34 (Page A-101) was defeated by Division I-A upon reconsideration, 43-68-7.]

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

### Principle Governing Financial Aid

**John C. Parry** (Butler University): On behalf of all the members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference, I would like to move Proposal No. 10.

[The motion was seconded.]

In reviewing the current NCAA principle of financial aid, it was clear that the current definition on the financial aid grant is whatever the Association defines it as. That is in the principle. This amendment does not increase the definition of current aid. It does not preclude the use of the special assistance fund. It does require that the new NCAA governance structure must return to the membership for one institution, one vote if there is any desire to add stipends.

The restructuring is guaranteed revenue. It is guaranteed championship access. At this point, the adoption of this proposal would guarantee your student-athletes that right

[Proposal No. 10 (Page A-51) was adopted, 660-115-30.]

### Principle of Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct

**Joseph J. McGowan Jr.** (Bellarmino College): On behalf of the NCAA Council, the Presidents Commission and the Presidents Commission's Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics, I move adoption of Proposal No. 11.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 11 modifies and strengthens the principle of ethical conduct presently found in our constitution. This proposal refers specifically to the fundamental values of respect, fairness, stability, honesty and responsibility, and in so doing, calls on each of us to establish policies that are consistent with the educational missions and goals of our institution. We can do no less.

As sportsmanship is the very foundation of athletics competition, ethical conduct is the very foundation of sportsmanship. I urge you to support Proposal No. 11.

[Proposal No. 11 (Page A-52) was adopted, 802-1.]

### Unethical Conduct

**Roy Kramer** (Southeastern Conference): On behalf of the Committee on Infractions, I move Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is somewhat of a housekeeping proposal that will confirm the present practice of finding unethical conduct with regard to an institutional staff member who is no longer at a particular institution.

It does not affect the infraction of an institution. If that individual leaves that institution prior to a case, you can find unethical conduct findings against that individual, who actually got the institution into difficulties in the first place. This simply carries that forward to that individual. Furthermore, it provides that a finding that has been practiced for many years—providing improper financial aid—is grounds for finding unethical conduct on the part of the individual who knowingly provides or arranges the provision of improper financial aid. On behalf of the Committee on Infractions, I urge the approval of this proposal.

General Business Session



posal.

[Proposal No. 13 (Page A-53) was adopted, 814-5-1.]

#### **Unethical Conduct**

**Larry R. Gerlach** (University of Utah): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

I serve as a member of the NCAA Professional Sports Liaison Committee. We have worked intensively on agent issues over the past two years. One of the most troublesome things we discovered is evidence indicating that some athletics department staff members are accepting benefits from agents and agents' runners, and arranging meetings between agents and student-athletes.

The intent of this proposal is to include all athletics department staff members, not just coaches, in the prescription against such conduct. It appears that managers, trainers, weight-room personnel and others associated with intercollegiate athletics programs are a significant part of the problem. The language in Proposal No. 14 already exists in Bylaw 11.3.3. However, the committee and the Council believe that the behavior this proposal is attempting to curb should also be treated as unethical conduct in Bylaw 10.1 as a way of demonstrating that the Association has low tolerance for these types of activities. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 14.

[Proposal No. 14 (Page A-54) was adopted, 817-3-3.]

#### **Ethical Conduct—Gambling**

**Larry R. Gerlach** (University of Utah): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

As a matter of policy that has been restated on many occasions, the Association opposes all forms of sports wagering because it undermines or carries the potential to undermine, the integrity of sports contests. Sports wagering, whether it is on intercollegiate athletics or professional sports, is illegal in every state except Nevada. As recent publicity clearly indicates, student-athletes are not immune to the growing problem of gambling on college campuses. Most gambling problems start on a small scale and mushroom quickly. A familiar pattern is that student-athletes may wager on contests other than their own, including professional sports, and quickly find themselves to be significantly in debt.

At this point, the student-athlete is offered a proposition to wager on intercollegiate teams' contests as a way to recoup his or her losses. This proposal would simply include professional sports in the prohibition against gambling by student-athletes. Adopting this proposal will thus help to retain the integrity of intercollegiate sports, raise awareness of the insidious nature of gambling and also protect the welfare of student-athletes. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 15.

**James J. Sims** (University of California, Riverside): I rise in opposition to this proposal. Maybe we can get a little more excitement here today. I don't think there is equal treatment for all of our students. I think we are signaling out student-athletes in this situation. You are

signaling out students who happen to be in Nevada and who happen to be 21 years of age. All other forms of gambling are already illegal. It is kind of a redundant waste of time. What are we doing? You are leaving something out.

In the beginning of this proposal, you have staff members. You leave the staff members out and still focus only on athletes. You have athletics staff members who are included in gambling on intercollegiate sports. Why are they not included in professional sports, too? I don't see the rationale for that. If we are going to legislate against gambling on professional football games, why not dog racing and horse racing? I think that basically gambling is illegal already, unless you are 21 and in Nevada. I oppose this proposal.

**Unidentified Delegate:** I just have a question. I assume this is intended to ban gambling as well, and if so, does that mean that horse racing, dog racing and jai-alai would be prohibited by this rule?

**President Corrigan:** It deals only with gambling in the sports context.

[Proposal No. 15 (Page A-54) was adopted, 614-168-35.]

#### **Financial Aid—Division I**

**R. Elaine Dreidame** (University of Dayton): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move Proposal No. 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 28-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment-to-the-amendment is necessary to take care of a technicality. After closely analyzing Proposal No. 28, the financial aid committee determined it was necessary to emphasize explicitly that all institutional aid beyond the value of tuition, fees and books, including supplies, transportation allowances and miscellaneous expenses, and not just room and board, must be awarded on the basis that student-athletes demonstrated need as determined by the central processing center.

The Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism urge adoption of this amendment of Proposal No. 28 to take care of the technicalities just identified.

**Tanya Yvette Hughes** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Arizona): We urge the membership to vote "no" on Proposal No. 28. The formula is simply not to determine a person's needs. For example, a student-athlete may narrowly miss aid to be considered needy, yet can't afford to pay room and board at an institution.

Currently, NCAA legislation does not permit the Division I student-athlete to work during the academic year without counting the income in his or her full grant-in-aid limitation. This proposal could limit this individual's access to an education. The student-athlete has one of two alternatives. One, have their parents give up moneys that they may or may not have, which they probably don't, or, two, decide to forego college altogether.

Another point of consideration is how productive in the classroom



and on the competitive field would this individual be? The structure associated with not knowing whether he would be able to pay next month's rent and buy food tomorrow will weigh heavily on the student. The student-athlete's welfare should not be deterred. We ask you to vote "no" on this proposal.

**Peter Likins** (Lehigh University): We will vote "yes" for Proposal No. 28 because we have had the opportunity over time to analyze very carefully the benefits, both academic and economic, that would flow from passage of this resolution.

We recognize that families who are able to afford to pay room and board for their sons and daughters would be obliged to do so. But with proper definitions, there doesn't need to be denial of access to the university education and an adverse impact on the impending balance within the NCAA. It is a proposal that makes a great deal of sense.

I need to say that I am sorry this proposal is before the Convention today. It is very serious business. It has been presented to us in a half-hearted way by the sponsors who really don't believe in it. Therefore, if a decision of this magnitude is accomplished by this body, it will require many months of careful communication and a lot of analysis. Then we would have an opportunity to truly understand the facts. That has not been the case. I realize I must, therefore, be a lonely voice today. Nonetheless, I felt I must speak. Thank you.

**Jeffrey H. Orleans** (Ivy Group): I would just like to make a couple of comments since we are the only Division I conference in the room today that does use a nontuition figure in financial aid. My first comment would be to the members of the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I believe they are correct. This legislation is flawed in not considering the possibility of either full cost of attendance or the ability of student-athletes to work.

On the other hand, we have for many years been able to award financial aid to many students. We have seven of the 15 broadest athletics programs in the NCAA. We have been able to be very successful and competitive upon the field for rewarding substantial amounts of need-based financial aid. The basic issue is the one that Peter Likins has just mentioned. This legislation began within the Presidents Commission as an initiative to explore whether some form of need-based aid would be useful, not simply for containing costs, but spreading the limited resources to extend more opportunities to more student-athletes.

Somewhere along the way, the Presidents Commission apparently lost its nerve. Instead of withdrawing this legislation, it has been presented to you today to be sacrificed. In the coming years, as we try to extend more and more opportunities to more and more students and face increasing financial constraints, we will one day have to come back and rethink some sort of a way to provide legitimate opportunity for our student-athletes. I hope when that day comes, that the presidents, who by our actions this morning now have assumed the responsibility and accountability for action of the NCAA to provide us clear thought and further leadership than they have provided with this measure, will fulfill their mission to provide real opportunity for our

student-athletes. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 28-1 (Page A-92) was defeated by Division I, 139-178-13.]

[Proposal No. 28 (page A-90) was defeated by Division I, 61-290-9.]

#### **Financial Aid—Division I Employment Earnings**

**Yvonne L. Slatton** (University of Iowa): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the interest of time, I would simply refer you to the rationale and will make a couple of comments. One is that as a member of the Committee on Infractions, I am acutely aware of the ability to abuse this kind of proposal. But in the interest of the student-athlete's welfare, it seems to me that we continue to restrict student-athletes because we can't figure out a way administratively to control the problem. I would simply leave you with a question that was raised by the student-athletes at a recent meeting: "Why is it that whenever the NCAA decides it cannot trust coaches or boosters, it restricts the freedom of student-athletes rather than punishing those who cannot be trusted?" Thank you.

**Calvin Bowers** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Bowling Green State University): Referring back to our executive director's opening comments last evening, one of his three key points facing intercollegiate athletics was the focus of welfare for student-athletes.

The NCAA has the ability in Proposal No. 31 to implement a tool now that will provide a standard of welfare for the student-athlete. The majority of the members within the Association seem to perceive the best that is available for student-athletes is allowing them to work. However, in many of our schools, being afforded the opportunity to work and earn money should substantially reduce the many financial strains that are represented to the student-athlete above and beyond the cost covered by the grant-in-aid.

In addition, invaluable work experience could be gained by the student-athletes for future endeavors. The NCAA talks of striving to bringing a student-athlete closer to a level or status of their peers, "the normal student." Yet, the student-athlete is separated from these student peers by this legislation. The students who attend the college or institution on a scholarship or full grant, but not involved in intercollegiate athletics is afforded the opportunity to work with no restrictions placed on their employment or earnings.

Proposal No. 31 is for the greater good of all student-athletes. It is time we put our trust into our Association and its members. This starts within your own institution and athletics department. We are students as well as athletes. We want to have a student life. This proposal will enable us to do so. We ask for your support of Proposal No. 31. Thank you.

**Frank R. A. Resnick** (Central Connecticut State University): Proposal No. 31 is representative of well-intentioned financial aid legislation often considered and adopted by the Association without full understanding of the implications. It is with a different twist, but it is



another visit to the same student employment legislation that was defeated at this Convention last year. I believe it must be opposed again for several reasons.

First, despite the arguments that the elimination of the \$1,500 cap will eliminate the problem of monitoring amounts earned, it does not eliminate the requirements. Compliance officers will still have to collect and analyze student-earnings records not for amounts earned, but now for when and where it was earned. You will have to consult with the on-campus and off-campus employers to determine which earnings are countable and/or exempt. Are you prepared to have students submitting time cards for their work at the local McDonald's?

Second, I understand the rationale and I have read the reports in the past. I have heard the requests of the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. They are not convincing. The fact is that students already can work on campus and they can work on or off campus during all school vacations, including up to one week before Christmas vacation.

Third, contrary to general reference of cost containment, this legislation will result in increased costs. In addition to the cost of policing, the institutions that will include work in individual-award limitations may be forced to match the exempted earnings with other aid in order to remain competitive.

These are a few examples of student-athletes who might need additional financial assistance who have enough time to work in the off season. I believe this proposal is too dramatic of a change from the current policies that have been carefully crafted and debated over many years. While the spirit of this legislation is good, it has not been carefully enough thought out and it would be costly. We should look at student employment and how it affects the student-athlete, but Proposal No. 31 would cause far more problems than it would solve. Thank you.

**James M. O'Fallon** (University of Oregon): I am somewhat divided about this proposal. It does seem to me that there are powerful arguments to be made on behalf of the student-athletes to allow them this earning opportunity. There are likely to be deleterious consequences with their academic success, because it is unlikely that the demands on these athletes are going to be reduced in order to make time for them to work.

I am inclined to come down again on the side of supporting the opportunity to work. I think that the basic thing that is wrong with this legislation is that it does create enforcement problems that can easily be taken care of by allowing our athletics department to participate in providing the work opportunities for the student-athletes. That provision that we have always put in there for purposes of maintaining competitive equality and worrying about the level playing field is exactly the wrong thing to continue to do if you are going to change and move toward allowing student-athletes to work. We can monitor it if we are involved in providing it, but we can't otherwise.

**Michael R. Heithaus** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Oberlin College): Once again, I would like to convey the advisory committee's belief that we must support this legislation. We believe that we must consider all student-athletes and the welfare of all stu-

dent-athletes, not just the student-athletes in revenue-producing sports where we believe that most of the infractions may occur.

Far more students will be benefitted by this legislation than those who may be caught in the harmful trap of cheating. We must also consider the bias against low-income student-athletes, which in itself will induce an ethnic bias. We believe that the values of this society go directly against inducing this ethnic bias. Also, the argument that student-athletes can work, I believe, is unconvincing. Working during vacation periods does not afford enough time to get enough money for many student-athletes. Also, in many cases, it does not provide enough time for the valuable experience to be gained, which is needed for future employment opportunities. Thank you.

**Dennis A. Farrell** (Big West Conference): Just a point of information prior to the vote on Proposal No. 31. I want to note to the Convention that the sponsors of Proposal No. 32 have withdrawn that proposal. That might be of interest to the delegates prior to voting on No. 31. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 31 (Page A-97) was defeated by Division I, 120-198-6.]

#### Financial Aid—Pell Grants—Division I

**Roy Kramer** (Southeastern Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I want to move Proposal 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

Having moved this proposal on numerous occasions, I bring it back to provide the entire amount of the Pell Grant to the student-athletes to whom it is entitled. We have on a number of occasions voted on this and from time to time there have been those who have said this has been in violation of federal regulation.

In September of this year, the NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism provided us with an interpretation that federal regulations do not prohibit a student-athlete from receiving a Pell Grant in combination with merit-based financial aid, and that an athletics grant is merit-based financial aid that is permissible beyond the cost of attendance. Federal regulations do preclude a student-athlete, or a student of any type, from receiving need-based aid in connection with the Pell Grant beyond the cost of attendance. It does not prevent them from receiving a Pell Grant in addition to the full athletics scholarship.

I would strongly urge this Convention, which on numerous occasions today has talked about giving something to the student-athletes, to for once stand up to that and provide the entire amount of the Pell Grant to the entitled student-athlete and not utilize it to hide it as part of a scholarship.

It is time we do this for the student-athlete. They are entitled to this. I strongly urge you to vote for this piece of legislation.

**Tami J. Fisher** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Vanderbilt University): The NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly supports Proposal No. 33 because Pell Grants are given to those individuals more in need of financial assistance to further their education.

We believe that the student-athletes who receive Pell Grants should



be allowed to have any special-assistance money that goes beyond the total cost of attendance. This is especially important in mainstreaming the student-athletes into the general population of students.

Because the general student population is allowed to use all of the scholarship and grant money they are awarded, the student-athlete has a right to be given the same opportunity. We urge your support of Proposal No. 33. Thank you.

**Frank R. A. Resnick** (Central Connecticut State University): I appreciate Mr. Kramer's remarks. I have debated with many delegates over the years that this proposal has been here. The issue of Pell Grants and financial aid entitlement in various forms has been on almost every agenda since 1983. This year is no different.

Proposal No. 33 is another effort to benefit the "haves" at the expense of the "have-nots," and it must be opposed. The rationale incorrectly emphasizes the confusion regarding Pell Grants. That is, that somehow student-athletes, as opposed to other students, are sometimes denied the Pell Grants. That simply is not true. All students, athletes or otherwise, receive their full Pell Grant and can already do so in combination with the full grant-in-aid so long as their total funds do not exceed the institutional cost of attendance.

This proposal would exempt the Pell Grant from any consideration. Passage could now enrich the student-athlete beyond that of the neediest student nonathlete. Further, elimination of the maximum award ceiling with the Pell Grant recipients would increase your institutional costs in order to remain competitive. While the rationale statement is accurate in that some students may receive merit-based aid in excess of the cost of attendance, it rarely ever occurs and never with institutionally administered aid. No financial aid office would ever award total dollars in an amount greater than the institution's cost of attendance. That is a basic principle of student financial aid. The NCAA should not be legislating such change. I urge your opposition. Thank you.

**William H. Harris** (Alabama State University): I represent one of the "have nots" and stand to speak on behalf of this proposal and to support the students. This is a much-needed change in NCAA legislation that will permit student-athletes, many of whom come from circumstances that require them to have great need, additional financial sources. The institution should be permitted to provide the Pell Grant to students when it is available to them and at the same time provide them full cost of attendance. Student-athletes make many contributions to our university. They have done so for years.

We told them that they can't have jobs. Now, we tell them they can't have their whole Pell Grant. Let's realize what we are doing and make it possible for young students to participate on behalf of our universities, and at the same time live with some dignity as they walk among other students on our campuses. I urge you to vote in favor of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 33 (Page A-100) was adopted by Division I, 203-113-8.]

#### **Maximum Awards—Division I Men's Basketball**

**James E. Delany** (Big Ten Conference): I would like to move Pro-

posal No. 35 on behalf of the sponsors.

[The motion was seconded.]

I have a script. Although it is personal, I would like to share it. Over the last 25 years, we have reduced grants-in-aid in Division I men's basketball from 20 to 15, and most recently to 13.

These changes were the result of broad policy efforts to contain costs and marshal resources for other uses, including the support of women's intercollegiate athletics opportunities. During the last couple of years, we have been assured by the Office of Civil Rights in the federal courts that there are three standards for meeting Title IX, not one. There are four important factors in determining equity and appropriate allocation of resources. Today, 100 percent of Division I institutions sponsor men's and women's basketball programs. On the high-school level, men's and women's basketball is the most popular and widely sponsored team sport in the country. More pre- and postcollege men and women play recreational basketball than any other team sport in the country.

Finally, basketball is challenging soccer for the most popular participation in a spectator sport. I believe there is sufficient interest, abilities and resources to provide 15 grants-in-aid in women's basketball and one less, 14, in Division I men's basketball. Since we have gone to 13 grants-in-aid, academic casualties, injuries and natural attrition are from time to time negligibly neglected in the Division I men's basketball squad sizes, practices and game preparedness. We have a great sport and great interest in that sport.

Clearly, every member in this Association, especially those in Divisions I-A, I-AA and I-AAA have benefitted greatly by the revenues derived from this sport. Let's provide an additional 300 grants-in-aid opportunities across 300 member institutions and avoid voting on the basis of impulse and motivation that have not been articulated during the past debates on the floor of this Convention. Let's demonstrate at today's Convention that one institution, one vote, works in a constructive way for all members of Division I. We should have the interest, ability and good sense to make this change today. Thank you.

**Richard J. Ensor** (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I would like to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 35.

This proposal, which has been before the Convention in the past, has been defeated every time. In the 1991 Convention, the Division I membership reduced the number of grants-in-aid for men's basketball from 15 to 13 for the 1993-94 academic year and thereafter. This action was taken as part of the reform package and was an effort to reduce cost and help balance inequity in Division I. There does not seem to be any compelling reason to increase the number of grants to 14. I would urge you to defeat Proposal No. 35.

**Brother Thomas J. Scanlan** (Manhattan College): I speak on behalf of the Presidents Commission and, once again, overwhelmingly in opposition to Proposal No. 35.

One of the problems with the old governance is that the same item is brought back each year with a different argument. We have seen this every year since its majority adoption in 1991. I warn the mem-

*General Business Session*



bers that this is the proverbial nose of the camel under the tent. Baseball, track, soccer and other sports are lined up outside to argue for reverses in their new camp numbers.

Reversing our reform efforts and cost containments is exacerbating the gender-equity challenge. Indeed, if we look at the landscape, the state of men's Division I basketball has never been better in terms of regular-season attendance and interest, greater competitive parity and increased interest in the "March dance." CBS, contrary to expectations, increased their bid to extend their contract in covering Division I basketball.

Division I basketball is better in all senses except one: the men's basketball graduation rate. Before Proposal 15 was passed earlier, I would have wagered that the vast majority of additional scholarships would be filled with partial qualifiers rather than with the dean's list of students who we honored last night. On behalf of the Presidents Commission, I urge you to once again vote "no" on Proposal No. 35.

[Proposal No. 35 (Page A-102) was defeated by Division I, 97-216.]

**President Corrigan:** We have concluded the business of the Presidential Agenda Day, unless someone wishes to reconsider any actions we have taken here this afternoon. This is your last opportunity to reconsider any action taken on Presidential Agenda Day items. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your attention. It has been a long day.

[The general business session was recessed at 5:40 p.m.]

## Tuesday Afternoon, January 9, 1996

The general business session was called to order at 1:30 p.m., by President Eugene Corrigan.

**President Corrigan:** Let me call this meeting to order and fill you in on what will take place this afternoon. We will handle some committee reports and then we will move into the general business session legislation. After we complete action on Proposal No. 96, I will have the report of Committee on Committees and the Nominating Committee. We will then continue to complete the Division I legislation remaining from this morning's session. You will recall at the opening business session it was indicated there would be some motions today that we will need to act upon. They are procedural in nature, having to do with various reports.

For the record, we need to approve the reports of the sports and general committees of the Association. These reports are in the 1994-95 Annual Reports of the Association. At this point, a motion for approval of those reports will be in order.

## REPORTS

*[Note: Motions were made, seconded and approved to accept the reports of sports and standing committees, secretary-treasurer, Council and Executive Committee.]*

## SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

**President Corrigan:** Before we begin voting on the remaining legislation, I would like for Barbara Hick of St. Bonaventure University

and the chair of the Memorial Resolutions Committee to give the supplemental report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee.

**Barbara Hick** (St. Bonaventure University): President Corrigan and delegates, in addition to those individuals who were recognized on Sunday, please add the following administrators:

Pat Amedure, Long Island  
Jeff Beard, Auburn  
Eugene Ellenson, Florida  
William Henry, Bowie State  
Robert Lindsay, Montana  
Abner McCall, Baylor  
Joseph Morasa, St. John's of New York  
Barry Pechman, Long Island  
Michael Pisano, St. John's of New York  
Sonny Roy, Southwestern Louisiana  
Christopher Ventresca, Hobart  
The student-athletes are:  
Rob Berthiaume, North Dakota  
Edwin Rodriguez, Farleigh Dickinson  
Michael Rush, Alabama  
Chris Schlager, Alvernia  
Keith Uhrig, Alvernia

We ask you now to please stand for a moment of silence for those who have gone before us. Thank you.

## COMMENTS

**President Corrigan:** Thank you very much, Barbara. You should have before you now the listing of actions taken during the various division and subdivision sessions earlier today. Those actions will stand unless they are reconsidered or rescinded in this session. If you are intending to call for reconsideration of an action, now is the time to do so. The window of reconsideration for actions taken earlier today is now open. Please be reminded that you must have voted on the prevailing side of an issue in order to call for reconsideration. Do we have such a call?

## RECONSIDERATION OF VOTING ACTIONS

### Reconsideration of Financial Aid—Equivalency Figure for Books

**Thomas F. Spicer** (Fort Hays State University): In consideration of the action taken by Division II on Proposal No. 52, Financial Aid—Equivalency Figure for Books, I respectfully ask that we be able to reconsider that for discussion and some decisions that would implement a more educated vote on this particular issue.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Terry Wanless** (University of North Dakota): The purpose in bringing back this legislation is to inform the Division II membership of the intent of the legislation versus the reality of the legislation.

Currently, under Bylaw 15.2.3.1, we have the opportunity, when dealing with the payment of books, to pay the real and actual costs of those books versus only using \$200 as a denominator for determining equivalencies. So, this legislation does not provide you with more monies to pay for books in which you are interested. You already have that

General Business Session



opportunity under current legislation. What this simply does is add \$200 to your denominator, therefore, enhancing your cost per scholarship. For example, in Division II, you have the opportunity to provide scholarships for 36 in football, 15 in basketball for men and women, and eight in volleyball. Your cost in just those four programs will be increased by \$12,200 without truly enhancing the opportunities that you already have for books for those student-athletes.

So, the intent was to help the student-athlete. This legislation does not help the student-athlete. It simply increases your cost. Thank you.

**Mr. Spicer:** To expand on what Terry has said, I want everybody to think about your nonrevenue sports, your emerging sports and your Olympic sports. This legislation lowers your equivalency. If you are on a fixed budget and you are giving, for example, your wrestling team or your women's swimming team a fixed amount of scholarships, you have just decreased the opportunity for student-athletes because your equivalency has been lowered. Therefore, if your dollars are fixed, you can't increase that. You have less opportunity to recruit student-athletes to your campus.

I seriously think that we voted on this with good intentions but without any study. I encourage you to read it again. Put some pencils to it quickly. Let's reverse our earlier decision and defeat it so that we can continue to offer opportunities to our emerging sports and our Olympic sports.

**Frank Cignetti** (Indiana University of Pennsylvania): I would like an interpretation of what the last speaker said. I think you would find an increase in the equivalencies, not a decrease.

**Christ Petrouleas** (Wayne State University, Michigan): I am a member of the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism. The previous speaker indicated that it would decrease equivalencies. That was erroneous. The same numbers will increase the enumerator as the denominator and will leave the equivalencies the same. Right now, if you are getting financial aid for post-allotment, it doesn't change the actual cost. All the committee wanted to do was to bring up the inflationary cost of the books into the denominator to better reflect what a grant-in-aid actually would cost on your campus.

**Mr. Spicer:** I may not be a wizard in math, but if you increase the denominator by \$200, that does bring down your equivalencies. If you are on a fixed budget, that does lower the number of dollars that you can spend for those same equivalent dollars that have now been changed because of the denominator going to \$400.

**Mr. Cignetti:** Again, I think that is misinformation for Division II because the equivalencies will increase if you increase the cost.

**Mr. Petrouleas:** We are talking about enumerators.

**President Corrigan:** We are talking about enumerators and denominators, is that correct? They are way back in my mind someplace.

**Mr. Petrouleas:** Gene, I don't know enumerators and denominators, but I know the equivalencies will increase.

**President Corrigan:** All right. Thank you.

**Karen L. Jones** (University of Alaska Fairbanks): We have been using these enumerators and denominators a number of times and our problem, like many of the Division II people, is that we do not put

books in the enumerator. Therefore, as Tom says, our equivalency number will be decreased. The dollar amount of the denominator will be increased. It does allow our student-athletes who are not on a full ride to earn an additional \$200.

**President Corrigan:** Are you speaking for the proposal?

**Ms. Jones:** I am speaking against the reconsideration.

**Mr. Wanless:** Again, I guess what I want to bring to the attention of the membership is that very issue. As we are looking at increased scholarships costs because of tuition hikes, we are automatically adding an increased scholarship cost to our budget. If we want to do that, we need to understand that. My concern is that there are a lot of people who did not understand that. It was simply the intent of the legislation from the floor to help the student-athletes. In terms of a full scholarship for a student-athlete, this does not help them.

You already have the opportunity to provide the real and actual costs of the books. I think there is a misconception about what this legislation really does. It does give us more money to spend for scholarships, but again, depending on the type of program that you have, with just four programs, you are going to increase your scholarship by over \$12,000. If we vote in the affirmative on that, then we need to please understand that.

[The motion to reconsider Proposal No. 52 (Page A-134) was defeated.]

**President Corrigan:** Are there any other items for reconsideration in any of the divisions? This is the time.

We will move to the remaining items to be voted on in this session. We will start with the first six proposals, which compromise the consent package. Let me remind you that these items stand as a package unless any delegate wishes to have one removed for action specifically by the Convention. At this time it will be appropriate for someone to move the adoption of the consent package.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

### Consent Package

**Carol J. Sprague** (University of Pittsburgh): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of the consent package.

[The motion was seconded.]

**President Corrigan:** It has been seconded. Are there any other comments?

[Proposal Nos. 1-6 were adopted as a consent package.]

**De Minimis Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes**  
**Robert J. Baugh** (Eastern Kentucky University): On behalf of the Council and the Eligibility Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 43-A and B.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to eliminate the ineligibility component from current legislation that affects a prospect's or student-athlete's eligibility when it is a representative of an institution who violates one of these pieces of legislation.

It is important to note that all violations of NCAA rules, including



those that affect this proposal, must be reported to the NCAA. One or more of the penalties outlined in Bylaw 19.6.1 will continue to be imposed upon the institution. The only difference is that it will not affect the eligibility of the student-athletes.

The Eligibility Committee believes this proposal is effective in a positive way in relation to de minimus violations that currently affect the prospects who have eligibility. We urge your support of this. Thank you very much.

[Parts A and B of Proposal No. 43 (Page A-122) were adopted.]

#### **Amateurism—Competition with Professionals**

**Rev. E. William Beauchamp** (University of Notre Dame): On behalf of the Council and the Olympics Sports Liaison Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

The sport of two-person sand volleyball becomes an open sport and will be included for the first time in the 1996 Summer Games in Atlanta. According to the International Volleyball Federation, an individual must participate in certain prize money events involving professional volleyball players in order to qualify for the Olympic team. The NCAA regulations generally prohibit individuals from participating on a professional team, but an exemption exists for the individual sports of golf and tennis. The Olympics Sports Liaison Committee has researched two-person sand volleyball events and the committee is convinced that the events are very similar to the kinds of competitions we have in golf and tennis.

The Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believe strongly that individuals should be allowed to compete with professionals in this unique sport without losing their amateur status, provided no payment of any kind is received by the student-athlete. Please vote "yes" for Proposal No. 45 so that college-eligible athletes are not denied the opportunity to participate for the United States in the Olympic Games. Thank you very much.

[Proposal No. 45 (Page A-127) was adopted.]

#### **Exception for World Championships Participation**

**Robert Bowlsby** (University of Iowa): On behalf of the Olympics Sports Liaison Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 46 would amend Bylaw 16.8.1.3 as follows: "An institution may provide student-athletes who are eligible to represent the institution in athletics competition with actual and necessary expenses related to participation in the following activities: the Olympic, Pan-American, World Championships, World Cup and World University Games qualifying competition."

They have become elite events in almost all sports and are considered as important as the other three competitions. The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believes including the World Championships and the World Cup in the application of legislation that provides exception for Olympic, Pan-American or World University Games will provide student-athletes with additional opportunities to represent their country in league competition.

On behalf of the Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I urge you to vote "yes" on Proposal No. 46. Thank you.

[Parts A, F and G of Proposal No. 46 (Page A-128) were adopted. Parts B and E were adopted by Divisions I, II and III. Part C was adopted by Division I. Part D was adopted by Divisions I and II.]

#### **Awards and Benefits—NCAA Championships and Bowl Games**

**M. Terry Holland** (University of Virginia): On behalf of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 47 will increase the number of complimentary admissions for NCAA championships or bowl games from four to six and will allow the student-athlete the opportunity to provide more tickets for family members who attend the championships. This change is consistent with the recent movement to provide additional benefits to student-athletes. In its August 1995 meeting, the Council agreed to sponsor this legislation on behalf of the Division I Men's Basketball Committee. We urge your support of Proposal No. 47.

[Proposal No. 47 (Page A-130) was adopted.]

#### **Athletically Related Employment Activities**

**David Price** (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the entire adoption of Proposal No. 126.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 126 leads off the deregulation package deemed with Bylaws 12 and 16. Simply, Proposal No. 126 removes unnecessary restrictions in the area of athletically related employment activities for student-athletes.

Part A federates the rule and allows us to address the issue separately in Parts B and C. The only difference in the proposal is that in Division I, the prohibition against coaching on a fee or lesser basis will be retained, while in Divisions II and III it would be deleted. We urge your support.

[Part A of Proposal No. 126 (Page A-244) was adopted. Part B was adopted by Division I. Part C was adopted by Divisions II and III.]

#### **Financial Donations From Outside Organizations**

**David A. Jacobs** (Whittier College): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move Proposal No. 127.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation eliminates much of the legislation related to what institutions can and cannot do as it relates to hosting and promoting professional contests in order to raise funds for the institution. This practice has become much more common. We feel that the institution should be given more leeway in hosting and promoting such contests than using the funds generated as they see fit. We urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 127 (Page A-246) was adopted.]



### Awards—Insignia and Personalization

**Melissa L. Conboy** (University of Notre Dame): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move Proposal No. 128.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would delete the requirement that awards must have some type of appropriate institutional insignia or events classification in order to be received by a student-athlete. As stated in the rationale statement, it no longer seems necessary to have such a requirement, especially when there will be limitations on the number and value of the awards received. One reason this requirement was originally adopted is because it was the belief that if the awards were personalized, it would keep them from being resold by the student-athletes. However, it seems the awards can be resold whether or not they are personalized and in some cases the personalizations may actually increase the resale value of the award.

This new legislation will continue to make it impermissible to award gift certificates or cash awards. I urge you to vote for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 128 (Page A-247) was adopted.]

### Awards Limitations

**Ms. Conboy:** On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move for passage of Proposal No. 129.

[The motion was seconded.]

You may have noted that Proposal No. 129 appears in a chart format, which is unusual for NCAA legislation. But it is presented to make it easier to follow the changes being proposed.

This legislation does increase the value of some of the awards that may be received or presented to student-athletes. These proposed changes will do two things. First, the proposed increased takes into account the inflation that has occurred since the current awards limitations were instituted. Second, this standardizes the awards limits at three levels, \$75, \$150 and \$300. This standardization will, hopefully, make it easier to understand and to apply. These are also supported by the financial aid and amateurism committee, and I urge your support. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 129 (Page A-247) was adopted.]

### Awards—Special Events and Bowls

**Ms. Conboy:** On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move Proposal No. 130.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is another of the deregulation proposals recommended by the Legislative Review Committee as a result of its review of Bylaw 16. It is the committee's opinion that the membership is not concerned about a student-athlete receiving an established national award even should the value of the actual trophy exceed the \$300 limitation. This exception will apply only to the trophy and will not permit the student-athlete to receive any merchandising award received on location. The bylaw does provide that the trophy must be applied directly by the management of the awards program.

In addition, the committee believes this exception is necessary to allow student-athletes to continue to receive awards such as the Heisman Trophy without violating NCAA regulations. I urge you to join the Council in supporting this proposal.

[Proposal No. 130 (Page A-249) was adopted.]

### Awards Banquets

**E. James McCloskey** (University of Florida): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 131.

[The motion was seconded.]

Again, this proposal is part of the series of recommendations as part of the deregulation effort of the Legislative Review Committee. At the present time, the bylaws limit an institution's ability to conduct recognition banquets for its student-athletes. A school can conduct one post-season banquet for each of its teams, one for all of its teams, and one to present academic honor awards to members of its teams. Each type of banquet is required to meet certain specific criteria. The purpose of this proposal is to renew all of these restrictions and allow the institution to conduct such recognition banquets at its discretion.

The committee believes that national legislation is not needed in this area. It does not anticipate an institution to be able to use such celebration and encourage students to attend that particular school. The proposal continues to place limitations on booster clubs-sponsored recognition banquets by limiting them to one per year per team, but removes the restrictions on the time of the year that the banquet can be held. I urge you to join the Council in support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 131 (Page A-249) was adopted.]

### Foreign-Tour Expenses

**David Price** (Pacific-10 Conference): On behalf of the Council and the Legislative Review Committee, I move Proposal No. 132.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal increases the per diem a student-athlete may receive for unitemized incidental expenses while on a foreign tour from \$10 to \$20. It is consistent with the 1995 legislation that boosted per diem for NCAA championships and postseason bowl games. We consider it to be a housekeeping item. I urge your support so I can leave the committee with a good batting average.

[Proposal No. 132 (Page A-251) was adopted.]

### Financial Aid—Exempted Government Grants

**Charlotte West** (Southern Illinois University at Carbondale): On behalf of the Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

The adoption of this proposal would include among the Association's exempted government grants moneys received from participation in AmeriCorps program. This means that student-athletes earning moneys in one of these federal programs would not need to have that com-



pensation included when determining their individual full grant-in-aid limits.

The Council and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism urge the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[Proposal No. 51 (Page A-133) was adopted.]

#### **Full Grant-in-Aid—Supplies**

**Jack Citrin** (University of California, Berkeley): On behalf of the Pac-10 Conference, I move Proposal No. 53-A.

[The motion was seconded.]

After hearing from our athletes, this proposal represents an overdue piece of legislation. It would permit institutions to provide aid for required and course-related supplies. In a number of courses, particularly in fine arts, design and architecture, required supplies are larger cost items for students than books. This proposal has a manifested educational purpose and would provide a needed equity to students enrolled in such courses.

There is an annual maximum of \$450 to help cost containment. As explained in the rationale statement, the equivalency calculation is kept simple.

I urge support of this legislation, which is in the academic interest of a large number of our student-athletes.

**Frank R. A. Resnick** (Central Connecticut State University): I wish to speak in opposition to Proposal No. 53.

This proposal adds course-related supplies to the valuable full grant-in-aid. It increases the national awards ceiling and it increases the institutional costs. This is not cost containment and clearly not the way to address the challenge of spiraling costs of scholarships.

While I clearly recognize the expense, there should be no fear that needy students don't go without supplies since Pell Grants, loans and other sources of noncountable aid and special assistance funds are all available for such purposes. At \$450, this is purely and simply a resolution that will dramatically increase institutional costs. I urge you to defeat it. Thank you.

**Carol Iwaoka** (Big Ten Conference): We were wondering about the effective date of August 1, 1996. Would this apply to grants-in-aid being awarded for 1996-97 or beginning with 1997-98 grants?

**Mr. Citrin:** Awards in 1996-97.

[Part A of Proposal No. 53 (Page A-134) was defeated. Parts B and C moot.]

#### **Academic Standing and Satisfactory Progress— Correspondence and Extension Courses**

**Michelle Palmisano** (Vanderbilt University): On behalf of the Council and the Academic Requirements Committee, I move Proposal No. 63.

[The motion was seconded.]

I serve as chair of the subcommittee of the Academic Requirements Committee that reviews satisfactory-progress waiver requests. Currently, we are reviewing on a case-by-case basis satisfactory progress request waivers that involve the use of correspondence and extension

courses taken at another institution after enrollment at the certifying institution.

Our legislative authority in this regard is not completely clear, however, because of the language identified in Proposal No. 63. This proposal simply will eliminate this confusing language and act for clarifying waivers. The committee doesn't have the authority to consider waiver requests in this area. I urge your support for this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 63 (Page A-146) was adopted.]

#### **Eligibility for Championships—Use of Banned Drugs**

**Patricia A. Thomas** (Georgetown University): I move adoption of Proposal No. 68 on behalf of the NCAA Council and the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports.

[The motion was seconded.]

I serve on the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. I also serve on the subcommittee that is devoted to drug testing and drug education. During the 1990 Convention, our membership voted to strengthen penalties for testing positive for the use of NCAA banned substances.

This legislation, which remains in effect today, calls for the permanent loss of eligibility for any student-athletes who test positive a second time for NCAA banned substances with the exception of the use of "street" drugs. Unfortunately, the current legislation presumes that a second positive test can only occur after a student-athlete restores eligibility from the initial positive test. Such is not the case. The student-athletes are tested by the NCAA during their period of ineligibility and regrettably some of them failed a second time. The competitive safeguards committee strongly believes a second positive test should result in permanent loss of eligibility regardless of whether the test occurs during the period of eligibility. The NCAA Council agreed. On behalf of these two groups, I urge your support of Proposal No. 68.

**James W. Watson** (West Liberty State College): I posed the question to the interpretations desk regarding this proposal and the issue of a "no-show" being treated as a positive, regardless of the reason why one did not attend when selected to appear at the drug testing, or any extenuating circumstances. That is treated as a positive.

So, I would just point out to the membership that should circumstances repeat themselves or should any individual fail due to extenuating circumstances to appear a second time for the sport involved, there is the severe penalty of being banned permanently. So, I just wish to point that out to the membership.

[Part A of Proposal No. 68 (Page A-150) was adopted by Divisions I, II and III. Part B was adopted.]

#### **National Collegiate Championship—Women's Crew**

**Barbara A. Hedges** (University of Washington): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 84 would establish an NCAA championship for women's crew. Currently, 74 institutions participate in women's crew. That exceeds the number necessary to establish a championship.

*General Business Session*



Women's crew is growing rapidly. We anticipate over the next few years that the number will increase dramatically. Adoption of an NCAA championship in women's crew will increase participation, will allow institutions to play under similar rules, will increase the awareness of women's crew and will provide additional visibility for this sport. On behalf of the sponsors, I urge your support.

**Joan C. Cronan** (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): On behalf of the Executive Committee, we urge your support of this proposal. We believe it is appropriate to conduct this championship effective in the 1996-97 academic year and urge your support for new opportunities for female athletes.

**Dennis A. Farrell** (Big West Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I wish to note for the record also the Council's support of Proposal No. 84 for the reasons stated by the previous speakers.

[Proposal No. 84 (Page A-185) was adopted.]

#### **Championships—Moratorium**

**Robert Bowlsby** (University of Iowa): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 86.

[The motion was seconded.]

Over the past 12 months, the USOC and an NCAA joint task force have been considering ways in which the two organizations might support one another while it carries each group's stated principles. This group produced a variety of potentially helpful concepts. I believe that I speak for all of the athletics directors who have been involved that good progress has been made.

Fundamental to our discussions has been a consideration of ways to maintain so-called "endangered" sports on college campuses. It seems to me to be appropriate that our Association take positive action described in Proposal 86, which will ensure the continuation of current championships while the task force implements programs to help fortify the sports sponsorships. I urge your support of Proposal No. 86.

**Greg Waggoner** (Western State College of Colorado): I, too, am in support of Proposal No. 86. I think that Nos. 86, 87 and 88 are all good legislation. The interest in these programs sometimes is misinterpreted due to the numbers, especially some of the smaller Division II programs.

If you look at the scholastic numbers that are feeding the collegiate programs and popularity of the sports, and the participation in a number of sports at that level compared to some of them, that doesn't have anything to do with interest. Just in conversations, sometimes I can find confusion with that. If we can differentiate between that and look at some of the outside forces in these dynamic times that have created some of these situations, then, I, too, think this is good legislation.

We are in support of the emerging sports. I think that it is fine to see women's program in the emerging sports come a long way. I think we should continue through the light of gender equity to support these programs that are in danger. This is money well spent in light of the NCAA's windfall in revenues in recent years. I think that supporting a championship in these emerging sports is certainly money well spent. A lot of institutions have long, deep cultures and traditions in these

sports. I think this body should support this legislation. Thank you.

**James M. Bensen** (Bemidji State University): I urge your support of Proposal No. 86. Excellence does not always follow us in large numbers, as was evident last year in the discussion on this same topic. Gymnastics regularly yields Olympic champions. We find that is true in other sports as well. It provides the opportunity for student-athletes to pursue excellence in areas where programs are small in numbers because of the geography, or in many cases, Division II schools playing up in a particular sport, which limits the numbers that are at the lower division.

**John D. Swofford** (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): In your Official Notice, it states that the Executive Committee took no position on this proposal. That has since changed. On behalf of the Executive Committee, we urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 86 (Page A-187) was adopted.]

#### **Championships—Minimum Sponsorship Criteria—Olympic Sports**

**William Byrne** (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

I had a two-hour speech prepared telling you about the importance of offering opportunity for athletes. But after hearing some of the other things, all I want to do is to let you know that it will continue to protect our Olympic sports.

You know the road to hell is paved with good intentions. We intend to protect lacrosse in Division II. In talking with Tricia Bork, she said we missed this as well as a couple of other sports. We will come back next year and protect those. The fact that the Olympic Committee will give some dollars to the sponsors of these sports tells us how important it is. Please pass this.

**John D. Swofford** (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill): The Executive Committee is opposed to this proposal. I hate to disagree with my good friend Bill Byrne, but there are two issues here, one of which Bill mentioned.

One is the sport of lacrosse, because it is not an Olympic sport. Even if that were handled a year from now, the issue that comes with the membership is whether you want to have no criteria, no minimal criteria for the maintenance or the establishment of these championships. The Executive Committee feels at this point that would be a mistake.

If this passes, we would have that situation with no mindsets in terms of maintaining or establishing championships. So, the Executive Committee urges you to defeat this proposal.

**Clayton W. Chapman** (Eastern College Athletic Conference): I would like to urge the Convention to support Proposal 87.

Without question, we all take pride in our student-athletes as they aspire to be the best they can be. I think it makes a statement for an Olympic team in his or her sport. Also, it makes a statement on the quality of our athletics programs. The primary goal of the NCAA is to provide opportunity for athletes to strive for those high goals. Guaranteeing a place for Olympic sports in our NCAA structure is a logical step in making that happen.



Last year, the membership demonstrated overwhelming support for retention of NCAA championships. With that in mind, we must do all we can to protect and enhance those same programs into the future. In this spirit, I urge your support of Proposal No. 87.

[Proposal No. 87 (Page A-187) was defeated.]

#### **National Collegiate Championships—Size of Field**

**Kelly J. Higgins** (University of Alaska Fairbanks): On behalf of the member institutions that sponsor men's rifle, skiing and fencing, I move Proposal No. 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

In 1983, the Executive Committee studied championship programs. As a result of this study, effective this year, the sizes of the competitive fields in the men's and women's national collegiate championships in rifle, skiing and fencing would be reduced by a total of 54 student-athletes. These reductions are the result of a conclusion reached in that study regarding the factor in monitoring the changes in the championships. The committee stated that the sizes of the championships fields are determined primarily by the sponsorship of those sports by the membership and the following factors: maintenance of a number of opportunities to men and women in the overall national championships programs; and response to allocation of the Association's resources to efficiently man the event.

In addition, the NCAA championship is intended for the finest athletes. It should be for those competitors who have a reasonable chance to play and win at the championship level. If these reductions had taken place five years ago, three individual national champions and numerous all-Americans could have failed to qualify for NCAA championships. There would be the elimination of two national champions and 33 all-Americans. In fencing, a reduction of 34 slots, effective this year, has forced the decision to remove the team event, while at the same time, the qualifiers have increased significantly with the addition of a new weapon to the competition.

Currently, these student-athletes are shopping around for schools to transfer to so they may have an opportunity to participate in the national championships. No doubt, there were some similar ramifications that were envisioned or desired in this message we wish to send. The total financial impact of the cuts in all three sports would net approximately \$50,000. Why not budget increases for 1996-97? In The NCAA News, we see there is approximately \$20 million. The maintenance of the number of opportunities for men and women's programs cannot be the issue. These three sports could be considered some of the most gender equitable regarding the quality of competition and/or qualified number per championships. I also submit that the efficient management and administration of events would not be affected and has not been a problem in these sports.

In fact, current NCAA skiing and rifle championships have only 50 percent of the competitors that compete in regular national and international events. However, the point that the championships need to be held for the finest student-athletes and those who have a chance to play at the championship level is salient. As I stated earlier, it is my

opinion that all-Americans in these sports will be in future championships. We acknowledge and appreciate the fact that these are difficult decisions that the Executive Committee is charged with and has had some great success regarding the future interest of the entire membership.

We applaud the efforts that have taken place to identify additional ways in which to admit student-athletes. As you are aware, the Executive Committee and the Council have opposed this legislation on the basis that they believe that much of the latitude is the exercise of fiduciary responsibility regarding the management of all championships. This proposal is not consistent with that principle. I agree wholeheartedly with that assessment, and it is not consistent with that. However, all previous avenues to us have been exhausted. I must admit that my opinion is biased because I care a great deal about the effect the production will have on the viability of those sports that are important to student-athletes, especially to residents and students who live in the interior of Alaska. It certainly appears to me there may have been insufficient information available about the ramifications these reductions will have on the quality of competition and the future of these sports.

It would seem a reasonable compromise could be reached. I asked earlier this year in a presentation where that magic line in the sand has to be drawn. I submit that line has already been crossed in these sports. We will eliminate all of those champions and all-Americans for a few dollars. The Executive Committee itself so stated this in the 1993 meeting that the championships program is a priority of the Association.

We are asking you to reaffirm that statement and relay that decision to have something further.

**Patricia Viverito** (Gateway Football Conference): I promise to be brief. On behalf of the Executive Committee, I urge the defeat of Proposal No. 88. The Executive Committee has made slight reductions in skiing, rifle and men's water polo, but at the same time, increased participation in 25 other championships. This action was primarily taken due to the low sponsorship of these sports as well as the membership's desire to devote more resources to the championships of greater sports sponsorship. We believe the Executive Committee does have flexibility to allocate championships resources. Sports with greater sponsorship is part of the budgeting process.

We are not opposed to additional opportunities for student-athletes. In fact, at the December meeting, the Executive Committee increased two championships—soccer and lacrosse. Since 1993, in fact, we have created more than 1,600 new championships opportunities. On behalf of the Executive Committee, I urge your defeat.

[Proposal No. 88 (Page A-188) was defeated.]

#### **Women's Softball Rules Committee**

**Joan C. Cronan** (University of Tennessee, Knoxville): On behalf of the Executive Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 93.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, the NCAA softball championships are conducted accord-



ing to the Amateur Softball Association rules. But it is becoming increasingly apparent that these rules are established primarily for use in recreational softball leagues.

The Executive Committee believes that the development of NCAA softball rules would meet its criteria and we urge your support. Thank you.

**Lacy Lee Baker** (National Softball Coaches Association): I urge your support of Proposal No. 93. As Joan said, softball is a game for age 10 and under all the way to 40 and over. We have tried repeatedly to change the rules to make our collegiate games more exciting and appealing. Time and time again, we have been voted down by the ASA. We feel that the collegiate game has progressed to the level where we need to control our own rules, mainly for the sake and safety of our collegiate student-athletes. The NCAA writes rules for 12 men's sports and six women's sports. Please add softball to the list by voting "yes" on Proposal No. 93. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 93 (Page A-193) was adopted (with immediate effective date).]

#### **Division I-AA Football Committee**

**Alan J. Hauser** (Appalachian State University): I would like to move Proposal No. 95.

[The motion was seconded.]

The membership in Division I-AA has grown substantially in recent years. It has a very diversified membership in terms of the types of schools that we have in Division I-AA. We believe that enlarging this committee will help improve the strength of the championships and it will also give, I would hasten to add, the NCAA an opportunity to add yet another committee to ensure that we have diversified representation by race and gender. Thank you.

**Kenneth A. Free** (Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference): On behalf of the Executive Committee, we urge your support of Proposal No. 95.

We agree with the sponsors of this legislation that expanding the Division I-AA Football Committee from four to eight members will provide greater representation for the membership and be more consistent with the administration of the Division I-AA championship. We urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 95 (Page A-194) was adopted.]

#### **Division II Women's Softball Committee**

**Susan A. Collins** (George Mason University): On behalf of the Division II Championship Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 96.

[The motion was seconded.]

Increasing the size of the Division II Women's Softball Committee from six to eight members will provide greater representation of the membership and assist the committee in administering the Division II Women's Softball Championship. This size will be consistent with other NCAA sports committees that are responsible for sports of a similar sponsorship. On behalf of the Division II Championship Committee, we urge your support of Proposal No. 96.

[Proposal No. 96 (Page A-194) was adopted (with immediate effective date).]

#### **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**President Corrigan:** We need to interrupt this portion of the agenda in order to elect new members of the sports committees and the Council and have a report of the Men's Committee on Committees.

[*Note: The delegates heard the reports of the Men's and Women's Committees on Committees and the Nominating Committee. The delegates approved the slate of candidates presented by the Nominating Committee.*]

**Wright Waters** (Southern Conference): Mr. President, the membership joins me in expressing our appreciation to you as president of the NCAA during this year of change. Your leadership inside and in all aspects of intercollegiate athletics is appreciated and admired. The Southern Conference celebrated our 75th anniversary this year and proudly acknowledges the achievements of the greatest left-handed football player in the history of the league. Thank you. (Applause)

**President Corrigan:** You better not tell any of my teammates that. We have reached the end of this part of the session and we know that some of you may leave.

We will now open the "window of reconsideration" for items that have been considered in this session up to this point. Are there any motions for reconsideration? All right. That window is closed. Please note that technically the full Convention can rescind the action of any division. Obviously, once you leave, you cannot participate in such votes.

For those of you from Divisions II and III who decide to leave, thank you very much for your great attention. For now, we will take a break.

[The general business session was recessed at 3:15 p.m. and reconvened at 3:30 p.m.]

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENTS**

**President Corrigan:** Let's begin this session. We need to get moving. I will direct your attention to Microphone No. 9. We are moving to Proposal No. 99.

#### **Coaching Limitations and Playing and Practice Seasons— Emerging Sports for Women**

**Mary Jo Warner** (George Washington University): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 99.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you recall, we voted at last year's Convention to establish a timetable for the application of NCAA rules for the emerging women's sports. At that time, it was determined that coaching limitations and playing and practice season legislation would apply beginning with the 1996-97 academic year. The legislation before you in Proposal No. 99 represents a culmination of discussions at various national governing bodies with representatives of institutions and conferences that sponsor the emerging women's sports. It was also reviewed by the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics. I urge you to support this legislation.



**Coaching Limits and Playing and Practice Seasons—  
Emerging Sports for Women—Crew**

**Carolyn Campbell** (Ivy Group): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal No. 99-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

As rowing becomes more popular among women, institutions will see the need to provide crews for lightweight as well as heavyweight rowers. In fact, the average college campus is composed of more women who fall in the lightweight category than the heavyweight category. The men's rowing programs sponsor both. The women's programs, which are looking for ways to increase opportunities for women, are doing so also. In order to provide a safe environment for all of the rowers, it is important to have an adequate number of coaches to supervise and teach. Amendment 99-1 allows for two additional coaches for institutions that sponsor a lightweight as well as heavyweight crew. In order to take advantage of this provision, an institution must compete in at least four events each of lightweight and heavyweight. This is comparable to the provision within NCAA regulations that allow for junior varsity and freshman football team coaching numbers.

[Proposal No. 99-1 (Page A-218) was adopted by Division I.]

**Clayton W. Chapman** (Eastern College Athletic Conference): On behalf of the sponsors, I move consideration of amendment-to-amendment No. 99-2.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of this proposal is to permit women's crew teams to take a single winter training trip for practice between the nontraditional fall segment and the traditional segment in the spring, as many crews do now, provided the trip does not exceed two weeks in length and provided it is counted as part of the maximum playing- and practice-season limitations.

Rowing can be practiced effectively only out of doors and only on a body of water, allowing institutions, particularly those in the northern part of the country, to take a winter training trip much like the advantage enjoyed by teams in warmer climates. We also note that the intent of this proposal dovetails with that of Proposal No. 3. Weather exceptions for women's crews were adopted as part of the noncontroversial consent package earlier this afternoon.

I urge the delegates to support this amendment-to-the-amendment.

[Proposal No. 99-2 (Page A-218) was adopted by Division I.]

**Amy Campbell** (Princeton University): On behalf of the sponsors, I move Proposal 99-3.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a housekeeping amendment to allow an exemption in any one season-ending championship event. When the NCAA championship is established, it will be a relevant event. Until that time, an institution should be able to exempt a championship event that applies to its particular geographical region and the local area.

[Proposal No. 99-3 (Page A-219) was adopted by Division I.]

**Ms. Campbell:** I rise to move Proposal No. 99-4.

[The motion was seconded.]

The U.S. Rowing Association Championship is not a collegiate event and it occurs during the summer. This amendment clarifies that the traditional segment may not continue beyond the spring collegiate rowing season and must end with the Cincinnati Regatta, which is currently considered the national championship event. The traditional segment will still be declared only through the conference championship or another regular-season event. This amendment does not change the number of weeks that must be counted for the limit.

[Proposal No. 99-4 (Page A-220) was adopted by Division I.]

[Proposal No. 99 (Page A-198) was adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 99-1, 99-2, 99-3 and 99-4. Part C was adopted by Division II. Parts D, E, F, G and H adopted by Divisions II and III.]

**Recruiting—Telephone Calls—Divisions I and II Basketball**

**James L. Hoyt** (University of Wisconsin, Madison): On behalf of all members of the Big Ten Conference and the NCAA Council, I move adoption of Proposal No. 100.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation, which does not permit basketball prospects to be contacted until July 1 following their junior year in high school, significantly inhibits the ability of coaches to effectively plan their travel and recruiting activities during the July evaluation period. This proposal will permit a coach to place one and only one phone call to a prospect between June 1 and July 1 to obtain this kind of information, which will allow coaches to target recruiting and save travel expenses. The prospects must have completed their junior year in high school before such contact.

**Robert J. Frank** (Oregon State University): The members of our NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urged us to vote against this legislation. It is not a matter of one phone call. It might be 100 phone calls from 100 institutions or coaches. Many student-athletes feel harassed and hurried. My colleagues urge you to defeat this proposal.

**Khalid Channell** (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of California, Irvine): The NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and myself oppose No. 100, which we believe to be a hindrance to the overall welfare of student-athletes. Basketball players in their junior year, especially those who are highly sought after by many colleges, do not need the extra burden of receiving calls from coaches between June 1 and July 1. At this time, athletes have the pressure of the college entrance exam and the future of basketball endeavors. With the passage of this legislation, the recruit will be subject to a number of phone calls in that period.

Current legislation allows the coach to send out written information that defines September 1 of their junior year, thus allowing the athlete to become well aware of those who are interested in athletics talent. In addition, the respective coaches can become aware of student-athletes' interest in their program to reciprocate communication, for it is written and they are there. Any information regarding class and summer



basketball camps can be given in the questionnaire, as well as from camp directors. Therefore, we feel that a phone call from the individual athlete is not vital in determining the talent by the coach. That will be for the player in question who is at a crossroad in their academic efforts. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges this body to vote down Proposal No. 100.

**Frederick E. Gruninger** (Rutgers University, New Brunswick): Moving from July 1 to June 1 in several parts of the country is certainly predicated on the fact that secondary schools have completed their educational process by the end of May. There are many states where the educational process does not need to be completed until the end of June. That is one of the reasons why we put in the July 1 date. We would indicate to the membership that we hope that we vote this down. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 100 (Page A-220) was defeated by Divisions I and II.]

#### **Recruiting—Written Correspondence—Student-Athletes**

**Mariah Snyder** (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities): On behalf of the Big Ten Conference, I move Proposal No. 102.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal eliminates enrolled student-athletes from engaging in written correspondence with prospects. Instances have occurred in which student-athletes have been directed to engage on a regular basis in a letter-writing campaign to prospects. This practice places a high degree of responsibility on the student-athletes. The proposed legislation will not permit a student-athlete to correspond even if they desire to do so. This proposed legislation will further the student-athlete's welfare.

[Proposal No. 102 (Page A-222) was adopted in Divisions I and II.]

#### **Division I Basketball—Evaluation Days**

**Chris Monasch** (Northeast Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 103.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will eliminate the term "calendar days" in Division I basketball during the evaluation period and establish evaluation days in order to simplify the calculating and evaluation possibilities. The "evaluation days" are defined as one coach engaged in evaluation of any prospect on one day. Two coaches making an evaluation on the same day shall use two evaluations. Under the current legislation, if one coach leaves campus to evaluate a prospect, the institution often finds it necessary to send another coach, who also evaluates another prospect since one of the 20 days would be used regardless of whether one or two coaches are off campus.

If adopted, the committee and the basketball coaches association believe that this will provide greater recruiting effectiveness and efficiency without causing any increase in cost. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 103.

[Proposal No. 103 (Page A-223) was adopted by Division I.]

#### **Recruiting—Division I Basketball**

**Mr. Monasch:** On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move adoption of Proposal No. 104.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit five recruiting opportunities in Division I basketball. The opportunities consist of contacts and evaluations combined during the academic year and specifies that not more than three of the five recruiting opportunities may be in-person, off-campus contacts.

Under the current recruiting legislation in NCAA Division I basketball, each institution is permitted two evaluations and three contacts. If adopted, this proposal will allow more institutional flexibility in managing recruiting possibilities and will permit each institution to use more evaluations. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 104.

**David Price** (Pacific-10 Conference): Proposal No. 104 was apparently aimed at recruiting high-school seniors in the sport of basketball who can be contacted a total of five times. However, current rules allow an institution to evaluate prospects who have not yet begun their senior year in high school on only two occasions.

The Council has issued an interpretation that the proposal would permit the institutions to evaluate these prospects up to five times. This has the potential of altering the manner in which we recruit high-school underclassmen basketball prospects. This proposal has some serious and probably unintended consequences. I, therefore, move to refer this to the Recruiting Committee for further review.

[The motion was seconded.]

**Charlotte West** (Southern Illinois University at Carbondale): I would hope that we would defeat the motion to refer and vote on the motion as it was presented with the idea that it would continue and it would be for senior prospects only. Let's ask the Council to reconsider the interpretation in their post-Convention meeting. We would continue to recruit in the manner that we have been recruiting. The evaluations are very much needed for the coaches. It is not increasing the number. The five stays the same. They are still very much going to have to have their contacts off campus.

This proposal allows them to have another evaluation. As you will note, it is very serious deciding who you select to give full scholarships to. You are making a four-year commitment. Coaches have found that a lot of times they get to the games and the person they have gone to watch is not playing a lot because it is lopsided or they are injured. There are all kinds of things that can happen.

It involves one evaluation, which is a poor procedure and not very economical. They simply want the flexibility to have another evaluation to make a very serious decision. I hope you defeat the motion to refer and vote on the motion that was presented. Allow the Council to reconsider that interpretation, which kind of shocked me when we arrived at the Convention. Thank you.

**David Price** (Pacific-10 Conference): I would ask that the Council review the interpretation, because it now has the potential of passing

General Business Session \_\_\_\_\_ 313



very significant legislation that can do some harm. Thank you.

**President Corrigan:** Thank you. We will do that. Proposal No. 104 is before you. The Council will review it if the proposal passes.

[The motion to refer Proposal No. 104 (Page A-225) was defeated. The proposal was adopted.]

#### **Recruiting—Electronic Transmissions—Divisions I and II**

**Mildred B. Griggs** (University of Illinois, Champaign): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 105.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would treat electronic mail as general correspondence, rather than telephone calls. Electronic communications would not be subject to the restrictions that currently apply to telephone calls. The sponsors believe that these types of communications are much less intrusive on the prospect's time than telephone calls. They, therefore, do not need to be regulated in the same way that telephone calls are regulated.

**Carolyn Campbell** (Ivy Group): I just want to point out on behalf of the sponsors this was designed as a cost-cutting measure. Using facsimiles and electronic mail are much less expensive than using the courier services or even the postal service. As was pointed out, these are nonintrusive forms of communication. I think it is a practical solution. I hope that you will support it. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 105 (Page A-226) was adopted by Division I. Withdrawn in Division III.]

#### **Recruiting—Notes**

**Vincent J. Dooley** (University of Georgia): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 107.

[The motion was seconded.]

The rationale for this legislation is pretty straightforward. First of all, the Recruiting Committee believes that all correspondence sent to prospective student-athletes should be sent through the mail. There is no need for any intermediary to work as a go-between for a coach and a young man or woman. Our rules should not permit a third party to act as the "runner" between a coach and a prospect. This has happened in the past at practices, competition sites and summer camps.

The adoption of Proposal No. 107 helps better ensure that the only intermediary between the institution and the prospective student-athlete would be the mail carrier. I urge your adoption of this proposal.

**John J. Crouthamel** (Syracuse University): Can I ask for a point of clarification? We just said that faxes are no longer mail. What is a fax? Can a fax be transmitted by a messenger?

**President Corrigan:** Sit down, Jake. (Laughter)

[Proposal No. 107 (Page A-228) was adopted by Divisions I and II.]

#### **Recruiting—Evaluations Subsequent to Signing—Division I**

**Betsy J. Mosher** (Northwestern University): On behalf of the Big Ten Conference, I move Proposal No. 110.

[The motion was seconded.]

The intent of the present legislation is to be able to evaluate unsigned prospects without worrying about exceeding the limits on those prospects who have already signed with the institution or who have been offered admissions. The exception is limited only to those prospects who have signed with the specific institution. The expansion of evaluation opportunities has been very minimal. Furthermore, there is a great deal of confusion among coaches and conferences, I believe, on the accountability of the evaluation of prospects in games in which their National Letter of Intent signing is involved. We believe that it would be clarifying and more active to the fact with the previous legislation.

**Brenda R. Weare** (Conference USA): I rise in opposition to Proposal No. 110. Last year, the legislation and what this proposal addresses was supported by the Recruiting Committee, placed in the consent package and passed with overwhelming success. That happened because the legislation currently in the books makes sense. We should not have to count evaluations after the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent, just in the same way we don't count contacts and we don't count phone calls. This legislation helps our coaches when attending all-star competitions, a new competition or competition outside of what they would normally have in their high-school season. I think that we need to be concerned when we start passing legislation or revoking legislation that makes sense to the coaches simply because of the compliance issue that is difficult to monitor or understand.

I think that our compliance coordinators have the ability to go out and properly educate our coaches. Certainly, we have done that in the Conference USA. They understand it and they like it, so I urge your opposition. Please vote this down. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 110 (Page A-230) was defeated by Division I.]

#### **Printed Recruiting Materials—Preenrollment Information—Divisions I and II**

**Stan Wilcox** (Big East Conference): On behalf of the Big East Conference, I move adoption of Proposal No. 111.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit the institutions that participate in the National Letter of Intent program the ability to send preenrollment information upon request to the prospect, provided the prospect has been accepted for enrollment. This will assist those prospects who will not be offered the National Letter of Intent, but who intend to walk on to an institution's athletics program the ability to receive important preenrollment information that will assist them in preparing for the academic year. I urge your support of this proposal.

**Vincent J. Dooley** (University of Georgia): That is exactly what I was going to say.

[Proposal No. 111 (Page A-231) was adopted (with immediate effective date) by Divisions I and II.]

#### **Printed Recruiting Materials—Schedule Cards—Divisions I and II**

**Steven P. Holton** (Northern Arizona University): On behalf of the members of the Big Sky Conference, I move Proposal No. 114.

[The motion was seconded.]



In the 1994 NCAA Convention, we reduced the number of permissible recruiting materials in the spirit of cost containment. As most universities continue to have schedule cards, with little or no costs, we would encourage the membership to pass this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 114 (Page A-234) was adopted by Divisions I and II.]

#### **Recruiting—Official Visits—Prior to Early Signing Period**

**Richard J. Ensor** (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Special Committee to Oversee Implementation of the NCAA Eligibility Clearinghouse, I move Proposal No. 115.

[The motion was seconded.]

The special committee proposed the amendment inasmuch as the requirements for initial eligibility called for presenting a list of 13 core courses; therefore, it feels that certification for an early official visit should be increased from seven to nine courses. Verification for an earlier official visit was intended to predict whether students can meet the 13 core requirements for initial eligibility prior to investing in the early visit prior to the early signing period. The special committee believes the increase in seven to nine is justified and rational. Thank you.

**George P. Browne** (Seton Hall University): I would just like to raise to the body the outside possibility that this would negatively affect current juniors. I am concerned about the timing of this. This year's juniors are already enrolled in all the courses they will be able to take before they have to meet this standard imposed upon them this next September. It seems to me that is going to be a problem.

**Mr. Ensor:** The effective date here will be when the 13 core courses go into effect, but we are getting an accurate prediction on the earlier official visits. It will go from 11 to 13. With that requirement, we have a better feel for whether or not these students are ready. That is what we are looking for at the same time.

[Proposal No. 115 (Page A-235) was adopted by Division I.]

#### **Resolution: Certification for Early Official Visit**

**Mildred B. Griggs** (University of Illinois, Champaign): On behalf of the NCAA Council, I move Proposal No. 117.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a resolution that directs three NCAA committees to study the desirability or necessity for the clearinghouse to certify the eligibility of prospects to early official visits. This is in consideration of the additional demands that this certification places on the clearinghouse and the expected recommendations at next year's Convention. Studying this issue certainly makes sense. I urge support of this resolution.

[Proposal No. 117 (Page A-237) was adopted by Division I.]

#### **Official Visits—Entertainment Allowance**

**Vincent J. Dooley** (University of Georgia): On behalf of the Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 119.

[The motion was seconded.]

We all know there have been a lot of changes since 1982. One thing that has not changed is the per diem that we provide to our student hosts to entertain prospects on their official visits to our campuses. The Recruiting Committee believes the proposed increase—\$10 per day with an additional \$5 a day increase for each prospect—is reasonable. It is intended to cover the increased cost of host activities and will help to better assure that those who volunteer as student hosts may not be put in the situation in which they may have to reach into their pockets to help with the recruiting process. Therefore, I urge your approval of Proposal No. 119.

**L. Oval Jaynes** (University of Pittsburgh): As a member of an institution cosponsoring Proposal No. 119, I rise to ask for support for this proposal. As presented in the Convention Program and mentioned in coach Dooley's remarks, the financial assistance for student-athletes for hosting a visiting prospect has not increased since 1982. This is a modest increase and certainly is appropriate. I ask the delegates here to join the NCAA Council and the NCAA Recruiting Committee to support Proposal No. 119.

[Proposal No. 119 (Page A-238) was adopted by Divisions I and II.]

#### **Recruiting—Nonscholastic-Based Basketball**

**Vincent J. Dooley** (University of Georgia): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move Proposal No. 120.

[The motion was seconded.]

In 1995, legislation was passed to prevent coaching staff members from participating in coaching activities involving nonscholastic teams. Over the past year, several questions have arisen concerning whether the coaching staff members could participate as members of the team.

Although it always has been the intent of the Recruiting Committee to restrict such participation if prospects are involved, the legislation does not indicate such restrictions. As a result, the Recruiting Committee believes that it is appropriate to add language to the legislation that specifically would prohibit participation by coaching staff members on a team that had individuals with eligibility remaining. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 120 (Page A-239) was adopted by Divisions I and II.]

#### **Recruiting—Division I Basketball Event Certification**

**Chris Monasch** (Northeast Conference): On behalf of the NCAA Council and the Recruiting Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 122.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Recruiting Committee, in conjunction with the National Association of Basketball Coaches and the Women's Basketball Coaches Association, have developed the summer basketball event certification program.

During 1995, approximately 175 men's and 150 women's events were certified. These events occurred only during the summer evaluation period. Camps are circumventing the legislation or scheduling

General Business Session



events during the fall contact period. During this period, the prospects can be evaluated by the operators and possibly enticed to attend these events.

In essence, the abuses that this Convention wanted to eliminate during the summer events have been moved and are now occurring during the fall. The previous legislation was successful and eliminated some of the abuses. Unfortunately, it now is occurring at other time periods. This legislation hopefully will eliminate those abuses. On behalf of the Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 122.

[Proposal No. 122 (Page A-241) was adopted by Division I.]

#### **Recruiting—Precollege Expense—Women's Crew**

**Carol J. Sprague** (University of Pittsburgh): On behalf of the Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 123.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would allow an institution to loan equipment to high school's and junior club programs' women's teams and to use their crew facilities for practice and competition.

Women's crew is an emerging women's sport. This proposal will help to encourage the development of women's crew as a junior club team at the high-school level, which will assure to help encourage more women to become involved in the sport of crew at the collegiate level. I urge your support of Proposal No. 123.

[Proposal No. 123 (Page A-242) was adopted by Divisions I and II. Moot in Division III.]

#### **CLOSING REMARKS**

**President Corrigan:** It appears that we have completed the work for this year. I would like to ask how many people are retiring and this will be the last meeting? Raise your paddles. Please leave your paddles at the end of the table. Thank you all. You have done a great job and good night. We are adjourned. Thank you very much.

[The general business session was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.]

## **Appendix A**

### **90th Annual Convention LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE MEMBERSHIP**

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.10, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption by the Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that were submitted with an immediate effective date are noted with an asterisk (\*) by the effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1995-96 NCAA Manual.] All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 90th annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments-to-amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*

#### **TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 90th ANNUAL CONVENTION**

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 6	Consent Package
7 through 41	Presidents Commission Grouping
42 through 50;	Amateurism/Awards/Benefits
126 through 133	
51 through 55	Financial Aid
56 through 68	Eligibility
69 through 83	Playing and Practice Seasons
84 through 91	Championships/Bowl Games
92 through 96	General
97 through 99	Personnel
100 through 125	Recruiting



## Consent Package

*Proposals 1 through 6 were offered as a "consent package" of amendments considered to be noncontroversial or "housekeeping" in nature. Any objection from an active or voting conference member to any item contained in this package will remove that item for a separate vote. The remainder of the package was acted upon with a single vote, requiring a two-thirds majority approval for adoption inasmuch as the package contains certain dominant provisions.*

### NO. 1 (NO. 2-5) WAIVER — FOUR-SPORT/THREE-SEASON REQUIREMENT

**Intent:** To permit the NCAA Council to waive the three-season membership requirement due to circumstances beyond an institution's control.

**A. Constitution:** Amend 3.2.4.11.2, page 11, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"3.2.4.11.2 Meeting Three-Season Requirement. An institution may utilize a sport to meet the three-season requirement only if the institution has met the minimum contest and participants requirements for sports sponsorship in that sport as set forth in 20.9.3.3 (Division I), 20.10.3.5 (Division II) or 20.11.3.2 (Division III).

**"3.2.4.11.2.1 Waiver. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the requirements of 3.2.4.11.2 due to circumstances beyond an institution's control."**

**B. Constitution:** Amend 3.2.5.2, page 12, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"3.2.5.2 Failure to Meet Four-Sport/Three-Season Requirement. If an active member no longer meets the four-sport/three-season requirement for either men or women, it shall be reclassified immediately as a corresponding member.

**"3.2.5.2.1 Waiver. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may grant waivers of 3.2.5.2 if it deems that unusual circumstances warrant such action."**

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** A member institution currently may receive a waiver of the minimum number of sports required based on conditions beyond the control of the institution as provided in NCAA Bylaw 20. However, if the institution meets minimum sports sponsorship requirements, but utilizes a sport above the minimum to meet the three-season criterion, there is no waiver available in the event the sport falls below the required number of contests or participants due to circumstances beyond the institution's

control. The Administrative Review Panel has jurisdiction in this area, but the panel has expressed concern regarding requests from institutions for waivers to avoid being placed in restricted membership or being classified as a corresponding member. The Council is better equipped to review waiver requests related to membership issues.

**Action:** Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

### NO. 2 (NO. 2-19) BROKEN-TIME PAYMENTS — U.S. OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

**Intent:** To increase from \$250 to \$300 per week the amount of broken-time payments an individual is permitted to receive from the U.S. Olympic Committee or the national governing body.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 12.4.2.4.1, page 76, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.4.2.4.1 Exception When Individual Not Enrolled in Regular Term. An individual may receive broken-time payments administered by the United States Olympic Committee or the national governing body in the sport during a period when the individual is not enrolled (full or part time) in a regular term to cover financial loss as a result of absence from employment as a direct result of practicing and competing on a national team (defined in 14.02.7), provided the amounts are consistent with the principles set forth in 12.4.1 and do not exceed \$250 **\$300** per week, and the payment period covers no more than the period from the date the individual begins practice with the national team following selection to that team to one week after the conclusion of the competition."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 16.11.1.1.1, page 223, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.11.1.1.1 Exception When Student-Athlete Not Enrolled in Regular Term. A student-athlete may receive broken-time payments administered by the United States Olympic Committee or the national governing body in the sport during a period when the student-athlete is not enrolled (full or part time) in a regular term to cover financial loss as a result of absence from employment as a direct result of practicing and competing on a national team (defined in 14.02.7), provided the amounts are consistent with the principles set forth in 12.4.1 and do not exceed \$250 **\$300** per week, and the payment period covers no more than the period from the date the student-athlete begins practice with the national team following selection to that team to one week after the conclusion of the competition."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This increase in the amount of broken-time payments an



individual is permitted to receive from the USOC or an NGB reflects the rate of inflation since January 1990, when the current \$250 limit was established. The committee used the Consumer Price Index (CPI-W) to determine the inflationary adjustment.

**Action:** Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

#### NO. 3 (NO. 2-82) EXPENSES FOR PRACTICE — WOMEN'S CREW — WEATHER EXCEPTION

**Intent:** To permit a member institution to provide expenses for its women's crew team to practice at a site beyond a 100-mile radius of the institution's campus if necessitated by weather conditions.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.8.1.1 by adding new 16.8.1.1.3, page 219, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, divided vote]

[16.8.1.1.1 and 16.8.1.1.2 unchanged.]

**"16.8.1.1.3 Women's Crew — Weather Exception. In the sport of women's crew, a member institution may transport a team to a practice site beyond 100 miles out of state if necessitated by weather conditions. Such practice shall occur only during an institution's official vacation period and must be within the institution's declared playing and practice season in the sport of women's crew."**

**Source:** NCAA Council; all members of the Ivy Group; Bucknell University; Colgate University; George Washington University; Georgetown University; Hobart and William Smith Colleges; College of the Holy Cross; Ithaca College; Mercyhurst College; University of New Hampshire; Northeastern University; Rutgers University, New Brunswick; Syracuse University; Temple University; Villanova University; Wesleyan University (Connecticut); and Williams College.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Many women's crew programs, particularly those that are located in the northern half of the country, are unable to practice outdoors during the early spring prior to the start of the traditional season. Lakes and rivers still are frozen or are dangerous because of cold water and weather. While limited competitive opportunities may be available for such programs on such trips, they are neither feasible nor desirable because of the level and nature of the practice needed at that early stage in the crew season. For many, therefore, the only available alternative is to travel to open water sites in the south in order to conduct much needed practice.

**Committee Position (Committee on Women's Athletics):** The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

#### NO. 4 (NO. 2-108) SUBMISSION DEADLINE FOR WAIVERS OF DIVISION MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA

**Intent:** To permit the NCAA Council to waive the September 15 submission deadline for waiver requests regarding division membership criteria due to circumstances beyond an institution's control.

**Bylaws:** Amend 20.3.5.2.1, page 356, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

**"20.3.5.2.1 Submission of Request. The institution shall submit (by mail or wired transmission) its request for a waiver (signed by the institution's chief executive officer) to the Association's executive director, and it shall be received in the national office not later than September 15. Any request received after that date shall be postmarked not later than September 8. The request shall include pertinent information supporting the institution's request. Additionally, the institution shall distribute the information to the chief executive officer, faculty athletics representative, athletics director and senior woman administrator of athletics programs at each member institution in the preferred division, as well as the executive officer of each member conference of that division, postmarked not later than December 1.**

**"20.3.5.2.1.1 Waiver. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the September 15 deadline set forth in 20.3.5.2.1 due to circumstances beyond an institution's control."**

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** There currently is no waiver of the September 15 submission deadline for waiver requests related to division membership criteria. Therefore, it is possible that a restricted member could fail to meet membership criteria after the September 15 deadline and not be eligible to apply for a Convention waiver before its active membership is transferred to corresponding membership. The Administrative Review Panel has jurisdiction in this area, but the panel has expressed concern regarding requests from institutions to avoid being placed in restricted membership or being classified as a corresponding member. The Council is better equipped to review waiver requests related to such membership issues.

**Action:** Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

#### NO. 5 (NO. 2-109) WAIVER — DIVISION I MINIMUM FINANCIAL AID AWARDS

**Intent:** To permit the NCAA Division I Steering Committee to waive requests related to the minimum financial aid awards required for Division I membership.

**Bylaws:** Amend 20.9.1.2 by adding new 20.9.1.2.9, page 363, as follows:

[Division I only]



**"20.9.1.2.9 Waiver of Minimum Financial Aid Awards. The Division I Steering Committee, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the minimum financial aid awards required for Division I membership based on objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances that warrant the waiver of the normal application of that legislation."**

**Source:** NCAA Council.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** There currently is no waiver of the Division I minimum-financial-aid-awards requirement and only one year of restricted membership is available. This penalty seems harsh, since legislation permits a member institution failing to meet the minimum sports sponsorship requirement one "free" year of probation. It is possible that a Division I institution could fail to meet financial aid requirements for legitimate and compelling reasons. The Administrative Review Panel currently has jurisdiction in this area, but the panel has expressed concern regarding requests from institutions to avoid being placed in restricted membership or being classified as a corresponding member. The Division I Steering Committee is better equipped to review waiver requests related to this issue.

**Action:** Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

#### **NO. 6 (NO. 2-110) WAIVER — DIVISION I SCHEDULING REQUIREMENTS**

**Intent:** To permit a waiver of the Division I scheduling requirement in situations beyond the control of the institution (e.g., weather conditions or natural disasters) that prevent the completion of scheduled competition.

**Bylaws:** Amend 20.9.4.1 by adding new 20.9.4.1.5, page 365, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"20.9.4.1.5 Waiver — Situations Beyond Institutional Control. The Division I Steering Committee, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve waivers of the scheduling requirement in situations beyond the control of the institution (e.g., weather conditions or natural disasters) that prevent the completion of scheduled competition."**

**Source:** NCAA Council; all members of the Southwest Conference; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Colorado; Colorado State University; Iowa State University; University of Kansas; Kansas State University; and Oklahoma State University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Current legislation permits a waiver of the minimum

number of intercollegiate contests in situations beyond the control of the institution (e.g., weather conditions) but does not recognize this same situation related to scheduling requirements. As a result, institutions faced with the cancellation of Division I contests due to weather can receive a minimum-contest waiver but cannot receive consideration for a waiver of the scheduling requirement. For example, an institution that schedules and completes 15 track meets against Division I institutions and three against Division II institutions (total of 18 meets) is in compliance with both bylaws. However, if four or more Division I contests are canceled due to weather conditions, the minimum-contest requirement (20.9.3.3) can be met with the allowable waiver for weather but the scheduling requirement (20.9.4) contains no such waiver and the institution fails to meet Division I membership requirements and is placed in restricted-membership status for one year. This proposal recognizes the impact weather can have on both the minimum number of contests and the scheduling legislation, which are dependent on each other. The NCAA Council has agreed to sponsor this proposal upon the recommendation of the Administrative Review Panel — the authority for waivers in this area currently rests with the panel, and it is believed that the Division I Steering Committee is better equipped to review waiver requests related to scheduling requirements in sports other than football and basketball.

**Action:** Nos. 1 through 6 were adopted as a consent package.

#### **Presidents Commission Grouping**

*The Presidents Commission designated the following 35 proposals for placement at this point in the agenda. Please note that inclusion of a proposal in this grouping does not constitute a position by the Commission for or against the proposal; rather, the proposals are placed here because the Commission believes that they are of particular interest to chief executive officers. The only proposals officially sponsored by the Commission are identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. Please note also the Commission designated all 35 proposals in this grouping for roll-call votes.*

#### **\*NO. 7 (NO. 2-2) NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING**

**Intent:** To revise the NCAA membership structure as specified.

**A. Constitution:** Amend 2 by adding new 2.7, page 4, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

#### **"2.7 THE PRINCIPLE OF DIVERSITY WITHIN GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES**

**"The Association shall promote diversity of representation within its various divisional governance structures and**



substructures. Each divisional governing body must assure gender and ethnic diversity among the membership of the bodies in the division's administrative structure."

- B. **Constitution:** Amend 3, pages 7-18, by deleting the current dominant voting requirements (\*) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

- C. **Constitution:** Amend 3.7, pages 18-19, by deleting the current common voting requirement (#) and substitution a federated voting requirement (I/II/III).

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

- D. **Constitution:** Amend 4.02.1 and 4.02.3, page 21, and 4.8, page 28,, by deleting the current dominant voting requirements (\*) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

- E. **Constitution:** Amend 4.02.2, page 21, by deleting the current common voting requirement (#) and substituting a federated voting requirement (I/II/III).

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

- F. **Constitution:** Amend 4 by adding 4.01, page 21, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

#### "4.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

"4.01.1 Structure. The Association's administrative structure shall include an Executive Committee comprised of institutional chief executive officers (CEOs) that oversees Association-wide issues and shall ensure that each division operates consistent with the basic purposes, fundamental policies and general principles of the Association (see Articles 1 and 2). In addition, the administrative structure of each division shall empower a body of institutional CEOs to set forth the policies, rules and regulations for operating the division. Further, the administrative structure of each division shall empower a body of athletics administrators and faculty athletics representatives (and in Division III, institutional CEOs) to make recommendations to the division's body of institutional CEOs and to handle responsibilities delegated to it.

"4.01.2 Guarantees. The Association's overall governance structure guarantees its members the following:

"4.01.2.1 Budget Allocations. Members are guaranteed revenue through allocations made to each division from the Association's general operating revenue. Division II shall receive at least 4.37 percent of the Association's annual general operating revenue. Division III shall receive at least 3.18 percent of the Association's annual general operating revenue.

"4.01.2.2 Championships. Members are guaranteed ac-

cess to national championships.

"4.01.2.3 Membership Services. Members are guaranteed services provided through the Association's national office at least at the level provided at the time of the adoption of this legislation (e.g., legislative services, statistics, research).

"4.01.2.4 Special Programs. Members are guaranteed the continuation of Association programs operating at the time of the adoption of this legislation (e.g., the catastrophic-injury insurance program, the drug-testing program, the Division I athletics-certification program). In addition, members are guaranteed the continuation of Association programs that were considered by the NCAA Council or Presidents Commission by the spring of 1995 and began operating after the adoption of this legislation."

- G. **Constitution:** Amend 4 by adding new 4.01, page 21, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

#### "4.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLES

"4.01.1 Divisions I-AA and I-AAA. Within Division I, the members of subdivisions I-AA and I-AAA shall receive revenue (from revenue sources existing at the time of the adoption of this legislation) through the division's revenue distribution formulas as they existed at the time of the adoption of this legislation." [Note: If adopted, this provision may be amended only by at least a two-thirds majority vote of all delegates present and voting at a Division I annual or special Convention.]

"4.01.2 Divisions I-AA and I-AAA. Within Division I, the members of subdivisions I-AA and I-AAA are guaranteed access to national championships at least at the level provided at the time of the adoption of this legislation." [Note: If adopted, this provision may be amended only by at least a two-thirds majority vote of all delegates present and voting at a Division I annual or special Convention.]

- H. **Constitution:** Amend 4.02 by adding new 4.02.1, page 21, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"4.02.1 Association. The "Association," as used in this Manual, refers to the National Collegiate Athletic Association, a diverse, voluntary, unincorporated Association of four-year colleges and universities, conferences, affiliated associations and other educational institutions."

- I. **Constitution:** Amend 4, pages 21-29, by deleting 4.1 through 4.6, pages 21-28.

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

- J. **Constitution:** Amend 4 by adding new 4.1, pages 21-23, as follows:



[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

#### **“4.1 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

“4.1.1 Composition. The Executive Committee shall consist of 20 members. The Association’s chief executive officer (e.g., executive director) and the chairs of each of the divisional Management Councils (see 4.5, 4.6 and 4.7) shall be ex officio nonvoting members, except that the Association’s chief executive officer is permitted to vote in the case of a tie among the voting members of the Executive Committee present and voting. The other 16 voting members of the Executive Committee shall include:

- “(a) Eight Division I-A chief executive officers from the Division I Board of Directors (see 4.2);
- “(b) Two Division I-AA chief executive officers from the Division I Board of Directors (see 4.2);
- “(c) Two Division I-AAA chief executive officers from the Division I Board of Directors (see 4.2);
- “(d) Two Division II chief executive officers from the Division II Presidents Council (see 4.3); and
- “(e) Two Division III chief executive officers from the Division III Presidents Council (see 4.4).

“4.1.1.1 Alternate. If a member of the Executive Committee is unable to attend a meeting, the division representatives in the divisional presidential governing body may designate an alternate from among themselves to attend the Executive Committee meeting.

“4.1.2 Duties and Responsibilities. The Executive Committee shall:

- “(a) Provide final approval and oversight of the Association’s budget;
- “(b) Employ the Association’s chief executive officer (e.g., executive director), who shall be administratively responsible to the Executive Committee and who shall be authorized to employ such other persons as may be necessary to conduct efficiently the business of the Association;
- “(c) Provide strategic planning for the Association as a whole;
- “(d) Identify core issues that affect the Association as a whole;
- “(e) Act on behalf of the Association to resolve core issues and other Association-wide matters;
- “(f) Initiate and settle litigation;
- “(g) Convene at least one combined meeting per year of the three divisional presidential governing bodies;
- “(h) Convene at least one same-site meeting per year of the three divisional Management Councils;

- “(i) Forward proposed amendments to Constitutions 1 and 2 and other dominant legislation to the entire membership for a vote; and

- “(j) Call for a vote of the entire membership on the action of any division that it determines to be contrary to the basic purposes, fundamental policies and general principles set forth in the Association’s Constitution.

“4.1.2.1 Challenged Action. The action of any specific division challenged by the Executive Committee as being contrary to the basic purposes, fundamental policies and general principles set forth in the Association’s Constitution may be overridden by the Association’s entire membership by a two-thirds majority vote of those institutions voting.

- “(k) Call for an annual or special Convention of the Association.

#### **“4.1.3 Election/Term of Office.**

“4.1.3.1 Election. Division I members of the Executive Committee shall be appointed by the Division I Board of Directors. Divisions II and III members of the Executive Committee shall be appointed by the Divisions II and III Presidents Councils, respectively.

“4.1.3.2 Terms. The terms of service of members of the Executive Committee shall coincide with their service on the applicable divisional presidential governing body, unless otherwise specified by that governing body.

“4.1.3.3 Committee Chair. The Executive Committee shall elect one of its members to serve for a two-year period as chair.”

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Articles 3 and 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

- K. Constitution: Amend 4 by adding new 4.2, pages 23-25, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

#### **“4.2 DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

“4.2.1 Composition. The Board of Directors shall include 15 members and shall be comprised of Division I chief executive officers (CEOs). The members of the Board shall include:

- “(a) One institutional CEO from each of the following eight conferences:

- “(1) Atlantic Coast Conference;
- “(2) Big East Conference;
- “(3) Big Eight (12) Conference;
- “(4) Big Ten Conference;
- “(5) Pacific-10 Conference;



- "(6) Southeastern Conference;
- "(7) Western Athletic Conference; and
- "(8) Conference USA.

"(b) One institutional CEO from either of the following two conferences:

- "(1) Big West Conference; or
- "(2) Mid-American Conference.

"(c) Six institutional CEOs from among the following conferences and at-large positions:

"(1) Nine Division I-AA Conferences:

- "Big Sky Conference;
- "Ivy Group;
- "Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference;
- "Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference;
- "Ohio Valley Conference;
- "Patriot League;
- "Southern Conference;
- "Southland Conference; or
- "Southwestern Athletic Conference.

"(2) Eleven Division I-AAA Conferences:

- "Atlantic 10 Conference;
- "Big South Conference;
- "Colonial Athletic Association;
- "Mid-Continent Conference;
- "Midwestern Collegiate Conference;
- "Missouri Valley Conference;
- "North Atlantic Conference;
- "Northeast Conference;
- "Sun Belt Conference;
- "Trans America Athletic Conference; or
- "West Coast Conference.

"(3) Two at-large positions from the Division I-AA and/or Division I-AAA membership used to fill the remaining Divisions I-AA and I-AAA positions on the Board of Directors or Division I Management Council.

"4.2.1.1 Divisions I-AA and I-AAA Conferences. A Division I-AA or Division I-AAA conference may not have more than one conference representative serving on the Board of Directors simultaneously. In addition, each Division I-AA and Division I-AAA conference must be represented on either the Board of Directors or the Division I Management Council (see 4.5), so long as that is possible.

"4.2.1.2 Increase or Decrease. The number of Board members from each category set forth in 4.2.1-(a), 4.2.1-(b) and 4.2.1-(c) shall remain the same regardless of an increase or decrease in the number of voting member conferences.

"4.2.1.3 Institution's Membership in Different Subdivision. An institution's CEO is eligible to serve on behalf of the multisport conference in which the institution holds membership, even if the institution's NCAA membership is in a different subdivision (e.g., Division I-AAA member that is a member of a Division I-A conference).

"4.2.2 Duties and Responsibilities. The Board of Directors shall:

- "(a) Establish and direct the general policy of Division I;
- "(b) Establish a strategic plan for Division I;
- "(c) Adopt administrative bylaws and regulations to govern Division I;
- "(d) Adopt operating bylaws and rules to govern Division I and/or delegate limited legislative powers to the Division I Management Council (see 5.3.2);
- "(e) Delegate to the Division I Management Council responsibilities for specific matters it deems appropriate;
- "(f) Ratify, amend or rescind the actions of the Division I Management Council (see 4.5);
- "(g) Assure that there is gender and ethnic diversity among its membership, the membership of the Division I Management Council (see 4.5) and the membership of each of the other bodies in the Division I administrative structure;
- "(h) Require bodies in the Division I administrative structure to alter (but not expand) their membership to achieve diversity;
- "(i) Approve an annual budget for Division I;
- "(j) Approve regulations providing for the expenditure of Division I funds and the distribution of Division I income consistent with the provisions of 4.01.2.1.1;
- "(k) Approve regulations providing for the administration of Division I championships; and
- "(l) Advise the Executive Committee concerning the employment of the Association's chief executive officer (e.g., executive director) and concerning the oversight of his or her employment.

"4.2.3 Selection/Term of Office

"4.2.3.1 Selection. Members of the Board of Directors shall be selected by the constituencies they represent.



sent. Each membership unit (e.g., conference) that is authorized to select or nominate individuals to serve on the Board must have a plan to assure diversity among those individuals that the membership unit identifies.

**“4.2.3.2 Term of Office.** Members of the Board of Directors shall serve for a term of four years. Board members are not eligible for immediate reelection.

**“4.2.3.3 Staggered Terms.** The terms of service of board members shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity. Members may be appointed for less than full terms in order to accomplish this purpose.

**“4.2.3.4 Determination of Full Term.** Board members who serve more than one-half of a term shall be considered to have served a full term.

**“4.2.4 Voting Method.** The method of voting on issues considered by the Board of Directors shall be by roll call, except for those actions taken by the unanimous consent of the Board members present and voting. Roll call vote results shall be reported to the membership.”

*[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Articles 3 and 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]*

**L. Constitution:** Amend 4 by adding new 4.3, page 25, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

#### **“4.3 DIVISION II PRESIDENTS COUNCIL**

**“4.3.1 Composition.** The composition of the Division II Presidents Council shall be based on a weighted regional representation by institutions that shall include one chief executive officer (CEO) per region for every 22 institutions in that region (see 4.9.2.1). In addition, two “at-large” positions shall exist to enhance efforts to achieve diversity of representation and to accommodate independent institutions.

**“4.3.1.1 Same Conference.** To the extent possible, CEOs from the same conference shall not serve concurrently on the Division II Presidents Council.

**“4.3.1.2 Same Institution.** To the extent possible, members of the Division II Presidents Council and the Division II Management Council (see 4.6) shall not be employed at the same institution.

**“4.3.2 Duties and Responsibilities.** The Division II Presidents Council shall:

**“(a) Implement policies adopted by the Association’s Executive Committee;**

**“(b) Establish and direct the general policy of Division II;**

**“(c) Establish a strategic plan for Division II;**

**“(d) Adopt noncontroversial and intent-based amendments, administrative bylaws and regulations to govern Division II;**

**“(e) Sponsor Division II legislation;**

**“(f) Identify Division II proposals for roll-call vote;**

**“(g) Delegate to the Division II Management Council responsibilities for specific matters it deems appropriate;**

**“(h) Approve recommendations of the Division II Management Council (see 4.6);**

**“(i) Ratify, amend or rescind the actions of the Division II Management Council (see 4.6);**

**“(j) Assure that there is gender and ethnic diversity among its membership, the membership of the Division II Management Council (see 4.6) and the membership of each of the other bodies in the Division II administrative structure;**

**“(k) Develop and approve the budget and the use of funds allotted to Division II (e.g., enhancement funds, funds for the operation of championships);**

**“(l) Approve regulations providing for expenditures and income to Division II;**

**“(m) Approve regulations providing for the administration of Division II championships;**

**“(n) Advise the Executive Committee concerning the employment of the Association’s chief executive officer (e.g., executive director) and concerning the oversight of his or her employment; and**

**“(o) Convene same-site meetings, as necessary, with the Division II Management Council.**

#### **“4.3.3 Election/Term of Office**

**“4.3.3.1 Selection Process.** When a vacancy on the Division II Presidents Council occurs, a formal call for nominations shall be published in The NCAA News. In addition, an informational letter to solicit nominations will be mailed to institutions and conference offices in the region where the vacancy exists. The members of the Council shall select an individual to fill a vacancy after reviewing nominations submitted by institutions and/or conference offices.

**“4.3.3.2 Term of Office.** Members of the Division II Presidents Council shall serve four-year terms. Council members are not eligible for immediate reelection. The chair and the vice-chair of the Council shall serve one-year terms. In addition, a member must serve a minimum of one year on the Council prior to serving as chair or vice-chair.

**“4.3.3.3 Staggered Terms.** The terms of service of Divi-



sion II Presidents Council members shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity. Members may be appointed for less than full terms in order to accomplish this purpose.

**"4.3.3.4 Determination of Full Term.** Division II Presidents Council members who serve more than one-half of a term shall be considered to have served a full term."

*[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Articles 3 and 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]*

**M. Constitution:** Amend 4 by adding new 4.4, pages 25-26, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

#### **"4.4 DIVISION III PRESIDENTS COUNCIL**

**"4.4.1 Composition.** The Division III Presidents Council shall include 11 members and shall be comprised of Division III chief executive officers (CEOs). At least two members of the Council shall be included from each Division III geographical region (see 4.9.2.2) and three members shall serve 'at large.' In addition, appropriate consideration shall be given to appointing Division III CEOs from historically black colleges and universities. The members of the Council shall include:

- "(a) At least two institutional CEOs from colleges or universities with full-time undergraduate enrollment of 4,000 or more;
- "(b) At least two institutional CEOs from colleges or universities with full-time undergraduate enrollment of less than 2,000;
- "(c) At least two institutional CEOs from public colleges or universities;
- "(d) At least two institutional CEOs from private colleges or universities;
- "(e) At least three institutional CEOs who are women;
- "(f) At least three institutional CEOs who are men;
- "(g) At least two institutional CEOs who are members of ethnic minorities; and
- "(h) At least two institutional CEOs who are not members of ethnic minorities.

**"4.4.2 Duties and Responsibilities.** The Division III Presidents Council shall:

- "(a) Implement policies adopted by the Association's Executive Committee;
- "(b) Establish and direct the general policy of Division III;
- "(c) Establish a strategic plan for Division III;
- "(d) Adopt noncontroversial and intent-based amendments, administrative bylaws and regulations to gov-

ern Division III;

- "(e) Sponsor Division III legislation;
- "(f) Identify Division III proposals for roll-call votes;
- "(g) Delegate the resolution of management issues to the Division III Management Council and ratify those actions (see 4.7);
- "(h) Ratify, amend or rescind the actions of the Division III Management Council (see 4.7);
- "(i) Assure that there is gender and ethnic diversity among its membership, the membership of the Division III Management Council (see 4.7) and the membership of each of the other bodies in the Division III administrative structure;
- "(j) Make budgetary recommendations to the Association's Executive Committee related to Division III matters, including championships and approve the use of funds allocated to Division III;
- "(k) Approve regulations providing for the administration of Division III championships; and
- "(l) Advise the Executive Committee concerning the employment of the Association's chief executive officer (e.g., executive director) and concerning the oversight of his or her employment.

#### **"4.4.3 Election/Term of Office**

**"4.4.3.1 Selection.** Members of the Division III Presidents Council shall be selected by Division III CEOs. The Council annually shall appoint a nominating committee, which shall present to the Council (prior to the Division III Convention) a slate of nominees to serve as members of the Council. Additional candidates shall be placed on the appropriate slate of nominees if such candidates have the endorsement of at least 10 CEOs of Division III institutions. In all cases, an effort shall be made to develop a balanced slate that provides fair representation among the division's regions, conferences and institutions.

**"4.4.3.1.1 Mail Vote.** Members of the Division III Presidents Council shall be elected by mail vote of the chief executive officers of Division III institutions. Voting by proxy shall not be allowed. The election shall not be subject to the requirement in Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, that all candidates in an election remain in contention until one receives a majority.

**"4.4.3.1.2 Vacancies.** The Division III Presidents Council, by a majority vote, may fill a vacancy that occurs among the members for the unexpired term. Members appointed to fill vacancies



shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that term.

"4.4.3.2 Term of Office. Members of the Division III Presidents Council shall serve four-year terms. Members shall not be eligible for another term on the Council until two years have elapsed. An individual may not serve on the Council for more than two terms.

"4.4.3.3 Staggered Terms. The terms of service of Division III Presidents Council members shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity. Members may be appointed for less than full terms in order to accomplish this purpose.

"4.4.3.4 Determination of Full Term. Division III Presidents Council members who serve more than one-half of a term shall be considered to have served a full term."

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Articles 3 and 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

N. Constitution: Amend 4 by adding new 4.5, pages 26-27, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

#### "4.5 DIVISION I MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

"4.5.1 Composition. The Division I Management Council shall include 34 members and shall be comprised of athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors, senior women administrators, assistant athletics directors, conference administrators) and faculty athletics representatives. The members of the Council shall include:

"(a) Two administrators or representatives from each of the following eight conferences:

- "(1) Atlantic Coast Conference;
- "(2) Big East Conference;
- "(3) Big Eight (12) Conference;
- "(4) Big Ten Conference;
- "(5) Pacific-10 Conference;
- "(6) Southeastern Conference;
- "(7) Western Athletic Conference; and
- "(8) Conference USA.

"(b) Two administrators or representatives from among the membership of the following two conferences:

- "(1) Big West Conference; and
- "(2) Mid-American Conference.

"(c) Sixteen administrators or representatives from among the following conferences and at-large positions:

"(1) Nine Division I-AA Conferences:

- "Big Sky Conference;
- "Ivy Group;
- "Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference;
- "Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference;
- "Ohio Valley Conference;
- "Patriot League;
- "Southern Conference;
- "Southland Conference; or
- "Southwestern Athletic Conference.

"(2) Eleven Division I-AAA Conferences:

- "Atlantic 10 Conference;
- "Big South Conference;
- "Colonial Athletic Association;
- "Mid-Continent Conference;
- "Midwestern Collegiate Conference;
- "Missouri Valley Conference;
- "North Atlantic Conference;
- "Northeast Conference;
- "Sun Belt Conference;
- "Trans America Athletic Conference; or
- "West Coast Conference.

"(3) Two at-large positions from the Division I-AA and/or Division I-AAA membership used to fill the remaining Divisions I-AA and I-AAA positions on the Board of Directors or Division I Management Council.

"4.5.1.1 Divisions I-AA and I-AAA Conferences. A Division I-AA or Division I-AAA conference may not have more than one conference representative serving on the Division I Management Council simultaneously. In addition, each Division I-AA and Division I-AAA conference shall be represented on either the Board of Directors (see 4.2) or the Division I Management Council, so long as that is possible.

"4.5.1.2 Increase or Decrease. The number of Management Council members from each category set forth in 4.5.1-(a), 4.5.1-(b) and 4.5.1-(c) shall remain the same regardless of an increase or decrease in the number of voting member conferences.

"4.5.1.3 Institution's Membership in Different Subdivision. An institution's administrator or representative is eligible to serve on behalf of the multisport conference in which the institution holds membership, even if the institution's NCAA membership is in a different subdivision (e.g., Division I-AAA member that is a



member of a Division I-A conference).

**"4.5.2 Duties and Responsibilities.** The Division I Management Council shall:

- "(a) Adopt operating bylaws and rules to govern Division I, subject to ratification by the Board of Directors (see 5.3.2);
- "(b) Take final action on matters delegated to it by the Board of Directors (see 4.2);
- "(c) Make recommendations to the Board of Directors on matters that it deems appropriate;
- "(d) Make interpretations of the bylaws of Division I;
- "(e) Suggest policies to the Board of Directors that are necessary to ensure the proper management of Division I;
- "(f) Review the recommendations of the substructure of Division I;
- "(g) Appoint the members of the substructure (e.g., cabinets and committees) of Division I;
- "(h) Review and approve policies and procedures governing the enforcement program of Division I;
- "(i) Recommend Division I championships policies, and fiscal, competitive and academic policies to the Board of Directors;
- "(j) Develop and administer the annual budget of Division I with the approval of the Board of Directors; and
- "(k) Advise the Board of Directors on the performance of the Association's chief executive officer (e.g., executive director).

**"4.5.3 Selection/Term of Office**

**"4.5.3.1 Selection.** Members of the Division I Management Council shall be selected by the constituencies that they represent. Each membership unit (e.g., conference) that is authorized to select or nominate individuals to serve on the Council must have a plan to assure diversity among these individuals that the membership unit identifies.

**"4.5.3.2 Term of Office.** Members of the Division I Management Council shall serve for a term of four years. Council members are not eligible for immediate reelection.

**"4.5.3.3 Staggered Terms.** The terms of service of Division I Management Council members shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity. Members may be appointed for less than full terms in order to accomplish this purpose.

**"4.5.3.4 Determination of Full Term.** Division I Man-

agement Council members who serve more than one-half of a term shall be considered to have served a full term.

**"4.5.4 Voting Method.** The method of voting on issues considered by the Division I Management Council shall be by roll call, except for actions taken by the unanimous consent of the Council members present and voting. Roll call vote results shall be reported to the membership"

*[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Articles 3 and 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]*

**O. Constitution:** Amend 4 by adding new 4.6, pages 27-28, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

**"4.6 DIVISION II MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

**"4.6.1 Composition.** The Division II Management Council shall be comprised of one administrator or representative from each of the Division II multisport voting conferences, one administrator or representative of Division II independent institutions and two 'at large' positions to enhance efforts to achieve diversity of representation. The members of the Council shall include:

- "(a) At least four directors of athletics;
- "(b) At least four senior women administrators;
- "(c) At least four faculty athletics representatives; and
- "(d) At least one conference administrator.

**"4.6.1.1 Same Institution.** To the extent possible, members of the Division II Presidents Council (see 4.3) and the Division II Management Council shall not be employed at the same institution.

**"4.6.2 Duties and Responsibilities.** The Division II Management Council shall:

- "(a) Implement policies adopted by the Association's Executive Committee and the Division II Presidents Council;
- "(b) Make recommendations to the Division II Presidents Council on matters it deems appropriate;
- "(c) Recommend the adoption of noncontroversial and intent-based amendments, administrative bylaws and regulations to govern Division II, subject to ratification by the Division II Presidents Council;
- "(d) Take final action on matters delegated to it by the Division II Presidents Council;
- "(e) Make interpretations of the bylaws of Division II;
- "(f) Review the recommendations of the substructure of Division II; and
- "(g) Appoint the members of the substructure of Division II.



#### "4.6.3 Election/Term of Office

"4.6.3.1 Selection Process. When a vacancy on the Division II Management Council occurs, each conference shall propose a slate of nominees that includes a director of athletics, a senior woman administrator and a faculty athletics representative and may include a conference administrator. The members of the Management Council shall select individuals to fill vacancies from the slates of nominees. Individuals selected by the Management Council must be ratified by the Division II Presidents Council.

"4.6.3.1.1 Convention Ratification. At the subsequent Division II Convention, individuals selected to fill Division II Management Council vacancies shall be ratified by the Division II membership. This ratification process shall not include a call for additional nominations.

"4.6.3.2 Term of Office. Members of the Division II Management Council shall serve four-year terms. Council members are not eligible for immediate reelection. The chair and the vice-chair of the Council shall serve one-year terms. In addition, a member must serve a minimum of one year on the Council prior to serving as chair or vice-chair.

"4.6.3.3 Staggered Terms. The terms of service of Division II Management Council members shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity. Members may be appointed for less than full terms in order to accomplish this purpose.

"4.6.3.4 Determination of Full Term. Division II Management Council members who serve more than one-half of a term shall be considered to have served a full term."

*[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Articles 3 and 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]*

- P. **Constitution:** Amend 4 by adding new 4.7, page 28, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

#### "4.7 DIVISION III MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

"4.7.1 Composition. The Division III Management Council shall include 16 members and shall be comprised of Division III chief executive officers (CEOs), faculty athletics representatives, directors of athletics, senior women administrators and conference representatives. At least two members shall be included from each Division III geographical region (see 4.9.2.2). The members of the Council shall include:

"(a) At least nine directors of athletics or senior women

administrators;

"(b) At least two institutional CEOs;

"(c) At least one faculty athletics representative;

"(d) At least three members of ethnic minorities;

"(e) At least five men; and

"(f) At least five women.

"4.7.2 Duties and Responsibilities. The Division III Management Council shall:

"(a) Implement policies adopted by the Association's Executive Committee and the Division III Presidents Council;

"(b) Resolve Division III issues;

"(c) Make recommendations to the Division III Presidents Council related to Division III matters as it deems appropriate, including budgetary recommendations and recommendations related to championships;

"(d) Adopt noncontroversial and intent-based amendments, administrative bylaws and regulations to govern Division III, subject to ratification by the Division III Presidents Council;

"(e) Recommend legislative proposals for sponsorship by the Division III Presidents Council;

"(f) Make interpretations of the bylaws of Division III; and

"(g) Delegate the resolution of Division III issues to the Division III substructure and consider relevant reports and recommendations from the Division III substructure.

#### "4.7.3 Election/Term of Office

"4.7.3.1 Selection. Members of the Division III Management Council shall be selected by the Division III membership. Annually, a slate of candidates shall be solicited from the Division III membership. The nominees will be identified by the Management Council (or a subcommittee of the Management Council), and then forwarded to the Division III Presidents Council for approval before consideration by the full Division III membership at the Division III Convention.

"4.7.3.1.1 Vacancies. When a vacancy occurs on the Council, the Council, by a majority vote, may fill the unexpired term. Members appointed to fill vacancies shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of that term.

"4.7.3.2 Election. The Division III Management Council members shall be elected at the Division III Convention. Members shall be elected by the Division III membership present and voting. The election shall not be



subject to the requirement in Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, that all candidates in an election remain in contention until one receives a majority.

**4.7.3.3 Term of Office.** Members of the Division III Management Council shall serve four-year terms. Members shall not be eligible for reelection to another term on the Council until four years have elapsed. A member may not serve on the Council more than two terms.

**4.7.3.4 Staggered Terms.** The terms of service of Division III Management Council members shall expire on a staggered basis to provide for continuity. Members may be appointed for less than full terms in order to accomplish this purpose.

**4.7.3.5 Determination of Full Term.** Division III Management Council members who serve more than one-half of a term shall be considered to have served a full term."

*[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Articles 3 and 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]*

**Q. Constitution:** Amend 4.7, page 28, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**4.7 4.8 COMMITTEES/CABINETS**

"The bylaws shall provide for the establishment of such *committees* a **governance substructure (e.g., cabinets, committees)** as the Association **each division** considers necessary. The number of members and tenure of *all standing committees, except the Council, Executive Committee, Administrative Committee and Presidents Commission* **each division's governance substructure** shall be stipulated in the bylaws (see Bylaw 21)."

**R. Constitution:** Amend 4.8, pages 28-29, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

**4.8 4.9 GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRICTS AND REGIONS**

**4.8.1 4.9.1 Districts.** The Association shall be divided into eight geographical districts to facilitate its work. They are as follows:

[4.8.1-(a) through 4.8.1-(h) relettered as 4.9.1-(a) through 4.9.1-(h), unchanged.]

**4.8.1.1 4.9.1.1 District Transfers.** Active member institutions may be transferred from their regular geographical districts by majority vote of the *delegates present and voting at an annual Convention or by majority vote of the Council* **Association's Executive Committee.** An annual listing of the geographical transfers of active members shall appear in the NCAA Directory.

**4.8.2 4.9.2 Geographical Regions.** For the purpose of representation on the *Council and Presidents Commission (see 4.1.1 and 4.5.1)* **Division II Presidents Council, the Division III Presidents Council and the Division III Management Council (see 4.3, 4.4 and**

**4.7),** the Association shall be divided into geographical regions.

**4.8.2.1 Division I.** The Division I geographical regions are as follows:

**(a) Region 1 — Districts 1 and 2;**

**(b) Region 2 — District 3;**

**(c) Region 3 — Districts 4 and 5; and**

**(d) Region 4 — Districts 6, 7 and 8."**

[4.8.2.2 and 4.8.2.3 renumbered as 4.9.2.1 and 4.9.2.2, unchanged.]

**S. Constitution:** Amend 5.01 and 5.02, page 31, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**5.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLES**

**5.01.1 Basis of Legislation.** All legislation of the Association that governs the conduct of the intercollegiate athletics programs of its member institutions shall be adopted by the membership in Convention assembled, **or by the presidential administrative groups and the division management councils as set forth in Constitution 4, as determined by the constitution and bylaws governing each division, and** shall be consistent with the purposes and fundamental policy set forth in Constitution 1, and shall be designed to advance one or more principles such as those set forth in Constitution 2.

**5.01.2 Approaches to Legislative Process.** The membership of the Association recognizes that certain **fundamental** policies, and practices **and principles** enacted through the legislative process have applicability to all members, while others are applicable to division groupings of members, based upon **on** a common philosophy shared among the individual members of the division and upon **on** special policies and concerns that are common to the nature and purposes of the institutions in the division.

**5.02 DEFINITIONS AND APPLICATIONS**

**5.02.1 Legislative (Constitution and Bylaw) Provisions**

**5.02.1.1 Dominant** A dominant provision is a regulation that applies to all members of the Association and is of sufficient importance to the entire membership that it requires a two-thirds majority vote of all delegates present and voting in joint session at an annual or special Convention. Dominant provisions are identified by an asterisk (\*).

**5.02.1.1.1 Division Dominant.** A division dominant provision is a regulation that applies to all members of a division and is of sufficient importance to the division that it requires a two-thirds majority vote of all delegates present and voting at a division's annual or special Convention. Division dominant provisions are identified by the plus sign (+).

**5.02.1.2 Common.** A common provision is a regulation that applies to all three divisions of the Association and is of sufficient importance to each division that it



requires a majority vote of the delegates of each of the three divisions, each division voting independently in joint session at an annual or special Convention, or in the event that any division does not have a quorum, as provided in 5.3.8.3.1. Common provisions are identified by the pound sign (#).

"5.02.1.3 General. A general provision is a regulation that applies to all three divisions of the Association and requires a majority vote of all delegates present and voting in joint session at an annual or special Convention. General provisions are identified by the plus sign (+).

"5.02.1.4 **5.02.1.2 Federated.** A federated provision is a regulation adopted by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting of one or more of the divisions or subdivisions of the Association, acting separately at any annual or special Convention or at a division legislative meeting of the Association **pursuant to the divisional legislative process described in 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5.** Such a provision applies only to the division(s) or subdivision(s) that adopts it. Federated provisions are identified by the Roman numeral(s) of the division(s) or subdivision(s) to which the provision is applicable."

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made to Article 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

**T. Constitution:** Amend 5.1.1, pages 31-32, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.1.1 Authorization

[5.1.1.1 unchanged.]

"5.1.1.2 Special Convention. A special Convention of the Association shall **may** be called by the president on the written request of 24 or more members of the Council or 24 or more members of the Presidents Commission **Executive Committee**"

[Remainder of 5.1.1 unchanged.]

**U. Constitution:** Amend 5.1.1.3 and 5.1.1.4, page 32, 5.1.4.3.4 through 5.1.4.3.7, page 34, 5.3.1.1.1, page 36, 5.3.1.2, page 36 and 5.3.2, pages 36-37, by deleting the current dominant voting requirements (\*) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

**V. Constitution:** Amend 5.1.1.3, page 32, as follows:

[Division I-A football only, roll call]

"5.1.1.3 Legislative Meeting — Division I-A. The Division I-A members of the Council, by a two-thirds majority vote, may schedule a Division I-A legislative meeting during June or August, at which the Division I-A membership may adopt legislation applicable to Division I-A except as prohibited in 5.1.4.3.4 and may propose legislation on other matters for consideration at the next annual Convention. Legislation adopted at the Division I-A legislative meeting shall not become effective prior to adjournment of the next annual Convention and is subject to the rescission provisions of 5.3.12."

**W. Constitution:** Amend 5.1.1.4, page 32, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

"5.1.1.4 Legislative Meeting — Division I-AA. The Division I-AA members of the Council,

by a two-thirds majority vote, may schedule a Division I-AA legislative meeting during the summer, at which the membership may adopt legislation applicable only to Division I-AA and may propose legislation on other matters for consideration at the next annual Convention. Legislation adopted at the Division I-AA legislative meeting shall not become effective prior to adjournment of the next annual Convention and is subject to the rescission provisions of 5.3.12."

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made to Article 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

**X. Constitution:** Amend 5.1.2 and 5.1.3, pages 32-33, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"5.1.2 Annual or Special Convention Programs

"5.1.2.1 Establishment of Program. The program of the business sessions of an annual or special Convention of the Association shall be established by the Council **Executive Committee**, acting as the convention program committee.

[5.1.2.1.1 and 5.1.2.2 unchanged.]

"5.1.2.3 Business and Discussion Sessions

"5.1.2.3.1 General Business Session. **When determined necessary by the Executive Committee**, an annual or special Convention shall include a general business session to enable all three divisions, meeting in joint session, to act upon **on the dominant, common and general legislation specified in Constitutions 1 and 2 and elsewhere, and on the actions of any division determined to be contrary to the Association's basic purposes, fundamental policies and general principles.**

"5.1.2.3.2 Division Business Sessions. An annual or special Convention may **shall** include separate division business sessions to:

"(a) Enable a single division to act, in accordance with the constitution and bylaws, on **federated** legislation pertaining only to that division and to act on legislation pertaining to more than a single division that is not a dominant, common or general provision;

[Remainder of 5.1.2.3.2 and 5.1.2.3.3 unchanged.]

"5.1.3 Annual or Special Convention Delegates

[5.1.3.1 through 5.1.3.4 unchanged.]

"5.1.3.5 Delegate Participation in Conventions and Meetings

"5.1.3.5.1 Active Delegate. Privileges of the floor and the right to active participation in the business proceedings of any annual or special Convention or division legislative meeting of the Association is accorded to the following:

[5.1.3.5.1-(a) and 5.1.3.5.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Any member of the Council, the Executive Committee or the Presidents Commission, **the divisional presidential administrative groups per 4.2 through 4.4,**



the divisional management councils per 4.5 through 4.7 and the chair (or a committee member designated to speak for the chair) of an NCAA committee listed in Bylaw 21; and

[Remainder of 5.1.3.5.1 and 5.1.3.5.2 unchanged.]

**Y. Constitution:** Amend 5.1.4.1 through 5.1.4.3.3, page 34, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**5.1.4 Operational Procedures**

[5.1.4.1 and 5.1.4.2 unchanged.]

**5.1.4.3 Consideration of Legislation.** Legislation shall be acted upon on only at the Convention business sessions in accordance with the constitution and bylaws.

[5.1.4.3.1 unchanged.]

**5.1.4.3.2 Legislation at General Session.** Dominant, common and general legislation per **Constitution 1 and 2 and elsewhere, and federated legislation determined by the Executive Committee to be contrary to the Association's basic purposes, fundamental policies and general principles** shall be acted upon by the divisions meeting in joint session.

**5.1.4.3.3 Legislation at Division Sessions.** Legislation pertaining only to a single division of the Association may be acted upon on in a separate legislative session of that division. Such division action shall be reported to the joint session of all three divisions, and the rescission provisions of 5.3.12 may be applied at that time. **Federated** legislation pertaining to more than a single division of the Association may be acted upon on by the appropriate divisions during the separate division business sessions if it is not a dominant, common or general provision.

**Z. Constitution:** Amend 5.1.4.3.4 through 5.1.4.3.7, page 34, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

[5.1.4.3.4 unchanged.]

[5.1.4.3.5 unchanged.]

**5.1.4.3.6 Ice Hockey.** An institution that is a member of a different division than its ice hockey classification shall vote on amendments pertaining to ice hockey in the division in which its ice hockey team is classified.

**5.1.4.3.7 Single Gender Athletics Program.** An active member or member conference with no men's athletics program shall not be permitted to vote on issues affecting only men's athletics, and an active member or member conference with no women's athletics program shall not be permitted to vote on issues affecting only women's athletics."

**AA. Constitution:** Amend 5.1.4.3.4 through 5.1.4.3.7, page 37, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions II and III, divided vote, roll call]

**5.1.4.3.4 Separate Voting, Division I Subdivisions.** Members of Division I-A and all other Division I members may vote separately on any federated provision (see 5.02.1.4), with the exception of the following:

"(a) Criteria for Division I membership as set forth in 20.9;

"(b) Criteria for Division I sports sponsorship as set forth in 20.9.3;

"(c) Requirements that an institution must meet to be eligible to enter a team or an individual in NCAA championship competition (see 18.4.2),

"(d) Requirements that a conference must meet to be eligible for automatic qualification into any Division I championship (see 18.5);

"(e) Number of grants permitted in basketball per 15.5.4; and

"(f) Personnel and squad limitations for the sport of basketball (see Bylaws 11 and 15).

**5.1.4.3.4.1 Financial Aid Option.** In sports other than football, an institution that is a member of a Division I subdivision that does not adopt a higher maximum limitation on financial aid per 15.1 may adopt a higher maximum limitation adopted by another Division I subdivision.

**5.1.4.3.5 Football Classification, Voting.** A member institution shall be entitled to vote on legislative issues pertaining only to football in the division in which it is classified in that sport.

**5.1.4.3.5.1 Restriction.** An active member or member conference with no football program shall not be permitted to vote on issues affecting only football.

**5.1.4.3.5.2 Divisions I-A and I-AA Football.** Members of Division I-A and Division I-AA shall vote separately in their respective subdivisions on legislative issues that pertain only to that sport.

**5.1.4.3.5.3 Division I-AA Member Applying Division I-A Football Legislation.** A Division I-AA member that elects to be governed by the legislation pertaining to Division I-A in football in accordance with 20.6.1.1 shall be eligible to vote on issues pertaining to the sport of football in Division I-AA.

**5.1.4.3.5.4 Conference of Divisions I-A and I-AA Members.** A Division I conference whose members are divided between Division I-A and Division I-AA shall vote in the subdivision in which the majority of its members are classified, or if the membership is divided equally between the two subdivisions, the subdivision in which it shall vote shall be determined by the Administrative Committee."

[5.1.4.3.6 and 5.1.4.3.7 renumbered and unchanged.]

**BB. Constitution:** Amend 5.1.4.4, pages 34-35, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**5.1.4.4 Voting Methods.** The methods of voting at an NCAA Convention shall be by voice, paddle, roll call and/or secret ballot, in accordance with the following procedures:

[5.1.4.4-(a) through 5.1.4.4-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Roll Call. Voting by roll call, on issues other than those so designated by the Presidents Commission **Divisions II and III presidential administrative groups** in accordance with 4.5.3-(g) **4.3.2-(f) and 4.4.2-(f)**, shall be conducted only when so ordered by a majority of the eligible delegates present and voting, following the making of an undebatable motion to vote in that manner. If



both a roll-call vote and a secret ballot are moved on a particular issue, the vote shall be taken first on whether to vote by roll call. Any interim or subsequent vote to amend, postpone, reconsider, refer or table a proposal that has been designated by the *Presidents Commission* **presidential administrative groups** for a roll-call vote during the Convention pursuant to 4.5.3-(g) also must be conducted by roll-call vote."

**CC. Constitution:** Amend 5.2, pages 35-36, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**"5.2 ELEMENTS OF LEGISLATION**

**"5.2.1 Constitution.** The membership may adopt legislation to be included in the constitution of the Association, which sets forth basic *principles* **purposes, fundamental policies and general principles** that generally serve as the basis on which the legislation of the Association shall be derived and which includes information relevant to the purposes of the Association, *its structure, membership and legislative processes.*

[5.2.2 unchanged.]

**"5.2.3 Administrative Bylaws.** The administrative bylaws of the Association (i.e., administrative regulations, executive regulations, enforcement policies and procedures, and athletics certification policies and procedures) provide rules and regulations for the implementation of policy adopted by the membership as set forth in the constitution and operating bylaws. They are distinct from the operating bylaws in that, to provide greater flexibility and efficiency in the conduct of the affairs of the Association, they may be adopted or amended by the *Council or Executive Committee as specified below* **applicable Division I or II presidential administrative group and the Division III Management Council per Constitution 4.2, 4.3 and 4.7.**

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in 5.2.3 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

[5.2.4 unchanged.]

**"5.2.5 Interpretations of Constitution and Bylaws.** The *Council, divisional presidential administrative groups and management councils per 4.2 through 4.7*, in the interim between Conventions, and the Interpretations Committee, in the interim between meetings of the *Council* **presidential administrative groups and management councils**, are empowered to make interpretations of the constitution and bylaws (see 5.4.1)."

[5.2.6 and 5.2.7 unchanged.]

**DD. Constitution:** Amend 5.3.1.1, page 36, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**"5.3.1.1 Amendment.** The *dominant, common and general* provisions of the **Constitution 1 and 2 and the division dominant provisions** and bylaws (including administrative bylaws) may be amended only at any annual or special Convention. **In Division I, fed-**

**erated provisions may be amended as specified in 5.3.2. In Divisions II and III, federated provisions may be amended at any annual or special Convention, and those applicable only to Division I-A or Division I-AA may be amended at any annual or special Convention or at the respective division legislative meeting.**

**EE. Constitution:** Amend 5.3.1 by deleting 5.3.1.1.1 and 5.3.1.2, page 36, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"5.3.1.1.1 Noncontroversial Amendment.** The Council, in the interim between annual Conventions, by a three-fourths majority of its members present and voting, may adopt noncontroversial legislative amendments clearly necessary to promote the normal and orderly administration of the Association's legislation. The Council shall not adopt recruiting or eligibility legislation pursuant to this provision. The Council shall sponsor legislation at the next annual Convention to confirm the adoption of such amendments.

**"5.3.1.2 Amendment-to-Amendment.** A proposed amendment to a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be amended at any annual or special Convention or at a division legislative meeting. From July 15 through September 15, sponsors of proposed legislation may refine and change proposals in any manner that is germane to the original proposal. After September 15, proposed amendments may be amended only if the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the provision to be amended."

**FF. Constitution:** Amend 5.3.1.1.1 and 5.3.1.2, page 36, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions II and III, divided vote, roll call]

**"5.3.1.1.1 Noncontroversial Amendment.** The *Council* **Division II Presidents Council or Division III Management Council**, in the interim between annual Conventions, by a three-fourths majority of its members present and voting, may adopt noncontroversial legislative amendments clearly necessary to promote the normal and orderly administration of the Association's **division's** legislation. The *Council* **Management Council** shall not adopt recruiting or eligibility legislation pursuant to this provision. The *Council* **Management Council** shall submit such amendments to the **division's Presidents Council for ratification and** shall sponsor legislation at the next annual Convention to confirm the adoption of such amendments.

**"5.3.1.2 Amendment-to-Amendment.** A proposed amendment to a **federated** provision of the constitution or bylaws **in Division II or III** may be amended at any annual or special Convention or at a division legislative meeting. From July 15 through September 15, sponsors of proposed legislation may refine and change proposals in any manner that is germane to the original proposal. After September 15, proposed amendments may be amended only if the amendment to the proposed amendment does not increase the modification of the provision to be amended."

**GG. Constitution:** Amend 5 by adding new 5.3.2, page 36, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:



[Division I only, roll call]

### **"5.3.2 Amendments to Division I Legislation**

**"5.3.2.1 Authority to Adopt or Amend Bylaws.** The bylaws applicable to Division I may be adopted or amended at any meeting of the Division I Board of Directors or of the Division I Management Council, in legislative areas delegated to it by the Board.

### **"5.3.2.2 Process for Adoption or Amendment of Bylaws**

**"5.3.2.2.1 Management Council Action.** Any change in a Division I bylaw shall be subject to initial approval at a meeting of the Division I Management Council by a majority vote of those present and voting. After initial Management Council approval, notice of the proposed change (including its effective date) shall be sent to the Division I membership for review and comment. At its next regular meeting after the period for review and comment, the Management Council shall consider the reactions and suggestions received and take action on the proposed change. If the proposed change receives a majority vote of those Management Council members present and voting, it shall be forwarded to the Board of Directors for consideration and possible adoption.

**"5.3.2.2.1.1 Alteration of Proposal.** If the Management Council alters a proposal after its initial approval but does not increase the modification of existing legislation beyond that of its initial proposal, it may proceed to take action to forward the proposal to the Board of Directors. If the alteration increases the modification beyond that initially approved, the Management Council shall forward the altered proposal to the Division I membership for review and comment before taking final action.

**"5.3.2.2.1.2 Exception for Legislation Adopted by Management Council.** The Board of Directors may authorize the Management Council to adopt legislation in some areas that can be effective without action by the Board. In such instances, the notice to the membership after initial Management Council approval shall so indicate.

**"5.3.2.2.1.3 Exception for Emergency Legislation.** The Board of Directors shall create a process that permits the Management Council or Board to adopt 'emergency' legislation that

may be effective immediately. The process shall include a requirement that such 'emergency' legislation may be adopted only by at least a three-fourths majority of the members of the adopting body present and voting.

**"5.3.2.2.2 Board of Directors Adoption.** Legislative changes that are approved by the Management Council shall be forwarded to the Board of Directors for adoption. A proposed change shall be considered adopted if it receives the favorable vote of a majority of those Board members present and voting.

**"5.3.2.2.2.1 Alteration of Proposal.** The Board of Directors may alter a proposal it receives from the Management Council. If the alteration does not increase the modification of current legislation beyond that of the Management Council approved proposal, the Board may approve it without further action. If the alteration increases the modification, the proposal shall be returned to the Council with the changes to provide an opportunity for review and comment by the division membership.

**"5.3.2.2.3 Separate Voting, Division I Subdivisions.** Members of the Board of Directors or Management Council who are representatives of institutions that are members of Division I-A and those that are representatives of institutions that are other Division I members may vote separately on any federated provision with the exception of the following:

**"(a) Criteria for Division I membership;**

**"(b) Criteria for Division I sports sponsorship;**

**"(c) Requirements that an institution must meet to be eligible to enter a team or an individual in NCAA championship competition in sports other than football;**

**"(d) Requirements that a conference must meet to be eligible for automatic qualification into any Division I championship in sports other than football;**

**"(e) Number of grants permitted in basketball; and**

**"(f) Personnel and squad limitations for the sport of basketball.**

**"5.3.2.2.3.1 Geographical Representation.** An institution classified as a Division I-A independent (e.g., Division I-A institution that is a member of a conference classified as Division



I-AA) shall have its views expressed on Division I-A issues by a predetermined Division I-A conference representative within the institution's geographical region.

**"5.3.2.2.3.2 Financial Aid Option.** In sports other than football, an institution that is a member of a Division I subdivision that does not adopt a higher maximum limitation of financial aid per 15.1 may adopt a higher maximum limitation adopted by another Division I subdivision.

**"5.3.2.2.3.3 Division I-A and I-AA Football.** Members of the Board of Directors or Management Council who are representatives of conferences that are members of Divisions I-A and I-AA shall vote separately in their respective subdivisions on legislative issues that pertain only to football.

**"5.3.2.2.3.3.1 Geographical Representation.** An institution classified as a Division I-A independent or a Division I-AA independent, shall have its views expressed on Division I-A or I-AA issues by a predetermined Division I-A or I-AA conference representative within the institution's geographical region.

**"5.3.2.3 Membership 'Override' of Legislative Changes.** The member institutions of Division I may override (e.g., rescind) the adoption of legislation enacted under the procedures set forth in 5.3.2.2.2 or the failure of the Board of Directors to act on or adopt legislation initiated and considered through the legislative process.

**"5.3.2.3.1 Call for an Override Vote.** In order to call for a vote to override the adoption of a legislative change or the failure of a legislative change, written requests for such a vote from at least 30 active Division I member institutions with voting privileges must be received in the national office by 5 p.m. Central time 60 days after the official publication to the membership of the legislative action. The requests must be signed by the institution's chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative.

**"5.3.2.3.2 Board of Directors Review.** Once the required number of submissions has been received, the Board of Directors will review its legislative decision (or the decision made by the Management Council in an area delegated to it). If the decision is not changed, a vote of the active mem-

bers of Division I shall take place at the next annual Convention of the Association.

**"5.3.2.3.3 Five-Eighths Majority Vote.** At least a five-eighths majority vote of the active Division I members present and voting shall be required to override the legislative action taken by the Board of Directors (or by the Management Council in an area delegated to it).

**"5.3.2.3.4 Effective Date of Override.** An override of the legislative action by vote of the Division I membership shall be effective upon adjournment of the Division I voting session in which the vote occurs.

#### **"5.3.2.4 Notification to Membership**

**"5.3.2.4.1 Initial Approval by Management Council.** Proposed changes in Division I legislation that receive the initial approval of the Management Council shall be published within 30 days of the approval for the information of the membership and to solicit the membership's review and comment. To be considered by the Management Council in its final review of the proposed change, any comment from the membership shall be received in the national office within 60 days of the date of its publication.

**"5.3.2.4.2 Action by Board of Directors.** After the Board of Directors (or the Management Council in an area delegated to it) has adopted, failed to take action or rejected a legislative change, it shall be published within 30 days of such action for the information of the membership and to permit the membership to seek to override the action in accordance with 5.3.2.3.

**"5.3.2.4.3 Final Action.** Once the adoption of the legislation has become final, it shall be published and incorporated into the next annual edition of the Manual.

**"5.3.2.5. Other Rules and Procedures.** The Board of Directors may approve such additional rules and procedures governing the Division I legislative process not inconsistent with the provisions of this section (5.3.2) as it determines are necessary to assure an efficient process to meet the legislative needs of the Division I membership."

*[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made to Article 5, including the deletion of the current sponsorship provisions for Division I legislation, to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]*

**HH. Constitution:** Amend 5.3.2, pages 36-37, as follows:



[Federated provision, Divisions II and III, divided vote, roll call]

**5.3.2 Sponsorship**

**5.3.2.1 Amendment.** An amendment to a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be sponsored by:

"(a) The Council;

"(b) A division steering committee;

"(c) (a) The Presidents Commission **Division II or III Presidents Council;**

"(d) (b) **Fifteen or more active member institutions with voting privileges in Division II and Eight or more active member institutions with voting privileges in Division III,** upon written verification of sponsorship signed by each sponsoring member's chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative;

"(c) **At least two member conferences with voting privileges in Division II when submitted by the chief elected or executive officer of the conferences on behalf of 15 or more of their active member institutions and signed by the chairs of the conferences' official presidential administrative groups or at least two chief executive officers of a conference's member institutions if a conference has no presidential administrative group; or**

"(e) (d) A member conference with voting privileges in **Division III,** when submitted by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference on behalf of eight or more of its active member institutions and signed by the chair of the conference's official presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative groups; or.

"(f) The Executive Committee (amendments to executive regulations only).

[5.3.2.1.1 and 5.3.2.1.2 unchanged.]

**5.3.2.2 Amendment-to-Amendment.** An amendment to an amendment of a provision of the constitution or bylaws may be sponsored by:

"(a) The Council;

"(b) A division steering committee;

"(c) (a) The Presidents Commission **Division II or III Presidents Council;**

"(d) (b) **Fifteen or more active member institutions with voting privileges in Division II and Eight or more active member institutions with voting privileges in Division III,** when submitted in writing by each institution's chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative;

"(c) **At least two member conferences with voting privileges in Division II, when submitted by the chief elected or executive officer of the conferences on behalf of 15 or more of their active member institutions and signed by the chairs of the conferences' official presidential administrative groups or at least two chief executive officers of a conference's member institutions if a conference has no presidential administrative group; or**

"(e) (d) A member conference with voting privileges in **Division III,** when submitted in writing by the chief elected or executive officer of the conference on behalf of eight or more of its active member institutions and signed by the chair of the conference's official presidential administrative group or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative groups; or.

"(f) The Executive Committee (amendment-to-amendment of executive regulations only)."

[Remainder of 5.3.2 unchanged.]

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made to Article 5 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

**II. Bylaws:** Amend 6 through 20, pages 45-377, and 22 through 32, pages 399-467, by deleting the current dominant voting requirements (\*) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**JJ. Bylaws:** Amend 6 through 20, pages 45-377, and 22 through 32, pages 399-467, by deleting the current common voting requirements (#) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

**KK. Bylaws:** Amend 6 through 20, pages 45-377, and 22 through 32, pages 399-467, by deleting the current general voting requirements (+) and substituting federated voting requirements (I/II/III).

[General provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**Source:** NCAA Council and Presidents Commission (Oversight Committee on the NCAA Membership Structure).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1997.

**Rationale:** This proposal provides the basic framework for a restructured Association. In this structure, institutional chief executive officers clearly will be established as the primary decision makers. Divisions will be provided a more federated governance structure to concentrate on issues unique to their members. The legislative process will be simplified to permit each division to operate more efficiently in responding to the needs of its membership. Although



the proposal sets forth a structure that permits the policies, rules and regulations that govern each institution to be determined in a divisionally federated structure, it maintains an Executive Committee to oversee Association-wide issues and to ensure that each division operates consistent with the basic purposes, fundamental policies and general principles of the Association. This proposal also provides each division constitutionally guaranteed championships access opportunities, administrative services and membership programs. In addition, minimum budget allocations are provided to Divisions II and III. Thereafter, a two-thirds vote of the entire Association's membership present and voting will be necessary to alter any of these minimum proportions. Further, the proposal preserves the revenue distribution formulas currently in place in Division I, with a two-thirds vote of all Division I members present and voting needed to change any of these formulas. This proposal has an effective date of August 1, 1997, and, thus, establishes an 18-month period to permit the divisional transition teams to set forth the specifics and details of this governance structure for an orderly transition, and to "fine tune" any provision contained in this proposal, as necessary.

**Action:** Parts A, B, D, H, I, Q, S, T, U, X, Y, BB, CC, DD, II adopted, 779-79-1. Part F adopted as amended by No. 7-1, 755-13. Part J adopted as amended by No. 7-14, 784-30-4. Parts C, E and JJ adopted (Division I, 320-6-1; Division II, 233-5-1; Division III, 281-4-1). Part KK adopted, 733-14-1. Parts L, O, R, AA, FF and HH adopted by Division II, 245-1-1. Parts M, P, R, AA, FF and HH adopted by Division III, paddle vote. Part G adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 7-2 and 7-3, 325-1. Part K adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 7-5-A and 7-6-A, 311-16. Part N adopted in Division I as amended by Nos. 7-5-B and 7-6-B, 310-4. Part R adopted by Division I, 312-1. Part Z adopted by Division I as amended by No. 7-9-A, 265-2-4. Part EE adopted by Division I, 308-3-1. Part GG adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 7-9-B, 7-10, 7-12 and 7-13, 316-3. Part V adopted by Division I-A, 115-0. Part W adopted by Division I-AA, 122-1.

## NO. 7-1 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To define general operating revenue.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part F, by adding new 4.01.2.1.1, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**"4.01.2.1.1 General Operating Revenue.** General operating revenue, as used in this section, shall include at least all sources of revenue existing at the time of the adoption of this legislation, including revenue from contracts for these existing sources, and revenue from any modified, extended or successor contract for such sources."

**Source:** All members of the New York Collegiate Athletic Confer-

ence.

**Rationale:** Bylaw 4.01.2.1 provides Divisions II and III with a constitutionally guaranteed minimum percentage of the Association's general operating revenue. This amendment clarifies that the Association's general operating revenue includes at least all sources of revenue existing at the time of the adoption of the restructuring legislation.

**Action:** Adopted, 829-10-3.

## NO. 7-2 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To specify the Division I revenue distribution formulas that will be constitutionally protected.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part G, 4.01.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

[4.01 unchanged.]

**"4.01.1 Divisions I-AA and I-AAA Revenue Guarantee.** Within Division I, all the members of subdivisions I-AA and I-AAA shall receive revenue (from revenue sources existing at the time of the adoption of this legislation) from all gross revenue sources received by the Association, unless specifically excluded, through the division's revenue distribution formulas as they existed at the time of the adoption of this legislation. [Note: If adopted, this provision may be amended only by at least a two-thirds majority vote of all delegates present and voting at a Division I annual or special Convention.]

**"4.01.1.1 Revenue from New Subdivision Championship.** This provision shall not apply to the distribution of revenue produced directly by a new subdivisional championship in a sport that has a subdivisional championship at the time of the adoption of this legislation. Any revenue produced by such a new subdivisional championship shall be distributed as determined by that subdivision.

**"4.01.1.2 Revenue Distribution Formula.** As used in this section, the components of the division's revenue distribution formulas as they existed at the time of the adoption of this legislation include the Academic Enhancement, Basketball, Conference Grant, Grant-in-Aid, Special Assistance, and Sports Sponsorship Funds, and the supplemental and reserve Funds intended for distribution to the membership.

**"4.01.1.2.1 Proportion of Total Revenue.** The proportion of total revenue allocated among these funds shall be as it existed at the time of the adoption of this legislation.

**"4.01.1.2.2 Formula for Allocation.** The formula for allocating each such fund among the members shall be as it existed at the time of the adoption of



this legislation."

**Source:** All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Midwestern Collegiate, Big South, Northeast, Missouri Valley, Southland, and Southwestern Athletic Conferences.

**Rationale:** The revenue distribution formulas being constitutionally guaranteed are an essential element of the restructuring proposal for the Division I membership. This amendment specifies that guarantee as it was agreed to by the Division I Task Force to Review the NCAA Membership Structure.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I, 321-4.

#### NO. 7-3 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To specify the access to national championships guaranteed to Divisions I-AA and I-AAA.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part G, 4.01.2, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.01.2 Divisions I-AA and I-AAA. Within Division I, the members of subdivisions I-AA and I-AAA are guaranteed access to national championships, (including the play-in structure in certain championships, sizes of championships fields, and the number and ratio of automatic-qualifying conferences), at least at the level provided at the time of the adoption of this legislation." [Note: If adopted, this provision may be amended only by at least a two-thirds majority vote of all delegates present and voting at a Division I annual or special Convention.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

**Rationale:** This provision provides detail to the constitutionally protected access to national championships guaranteed to Divisions I-AA and I-AAA.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I, 326-1.

#### NO. 7-4 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** In Division I, to permit an Executive Committee member's constituent body to select an alternate to attend an Executive Committee meeting when the Executive Committee member is unable to attend.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part J, 4.1.1.1, as follows:  
[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"4.1.1.1 Alternate. If a member of the Executive Committee is unable to attend a meeting of the Executive Committee, the constituent body which that member represents may designate an alternate to attend that meeting. In Division I, the constituent body shall be that which originally select-

ed the member to the Division I Board of Directors. Each alternate shall be selected on a standing basis by the constituent body and the NCAA shall be notified of this selection. If both the member and the alternate are unable to attend an Executive Committee meeting, the constituent body shall not be represented at that meeting. In Divisions II and III, the division representatives in the division's presidential governing body may designate an alternate from among themselves to attend the Executive Committee meeting."

**Source:** University of Arizona; Arizona State University; Brigham Young University; University of California, Los Angeles; Colorado State University; University of Hawaii, Manoa; University of New Mexico; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; San Diego State University; University of Southern California; University of Texas, El Paso; U.S. Air Force Academy; University of Washington; Washington State University; and University of Wyoming.

**Rationale:** In a representative system of governance, member institutions may participate in the legislative process only through their selected representatives. If a conference's representative is unable to attend a meeting, the entire conference is penalized by being excluded from participation in the governance process. Voting relationships may be affected. It is preferable for the group that selected its representative to name an alternate rather than be absent.

**Action:** Moot.

#### NO. 7-5 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To confirm the commitment to assure diversity of representation in the new governance structure.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part K, 4.2.1, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.2 DIVISION I BOARD OF DIRECTORS

"4.2.1 Composition. Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, the Board of Directors shall include 15 members and shall be comprised of Division I chief executive officers (CEOs). The members of the Board shall include:  
[Remainder of 4.2.1 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part N, 4.5.1, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5 DIVISION I MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

"4.5.1 Composition. Giving due weight to gender and ethnic diversity, the Division I Management Council shall include 34 members and shall be comprised of athletics administrators (e.g., athletics directors, senior women administrators, assistant



athletics directors, conference administrators) and faculty athletics representatives. The members of the Council shall include."

[Remainder of 4.5.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Presidents Commission.

**Rationale:** This provision reiterates that Division I chief executive officers are committed to assuring that due weight is given to gender and ethnic diversity in the selection of representatives to the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council.

**Action:** Part A adopted by Division I, 325-1. Part B adopted by Division I, 323-1-2.

#### NO. 7-6 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To specify that Divisions I-AA and I-AAA conferences that currently meet appropriate membership criteria should continue to be represented on the Division I Board of Directors or Management Council so long as they meet such criteria; to specify that other Divisions I-AA and I-AAA conferences that meet the appropriate membership criteria in the future shall also be represented so long as that is possible, and to delete the prohibition against more than one representative from the same conference serving on the Management Council at the same time.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part K, 4.2.1.1, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.2.1.1 Divisions I-AA and I-AAA Conferences. A Division I-AA or Division I-AAA conference may not have more than one conference representative serving on the Board of Directors simultaneously. In addition, each Division I-AA and Division I-AAA conference (**which qualified for representation at the time of the adoption of this legislation**) must be represented on either the Board of Directors or the Division I Management Council (see 4.5) so long as that **conference continues to meet the Division I-AA or I-AAA membership requirements, is possible. Other Division I-AA or Division I-AAA conferences that meet the Division I-AA or I-AAA membership requirements shall be represented on either the Board of Directors or the Management Council so long as that is possible.**"

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part N, 4.5.1.1, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.5.1.1 Divisions I-AA and I-AAA Conferences. A Division I-AA or Division I-AAA conference may not have more than one conference representative serving on the Division I Management Council simultaneously. In addition, **Each Division I-AA and Division I-AAA conference (which qualified for representation at the time of the adoption of this legislation) must** shall be represented on either the Board of Directors

(see 4.2) or the Division I Management Council, so long as that **conference continues to meet the Division I-AA or I-AAA membership requirements, is possible. Other Division I-AA or Division I-AAA conferences that meet the Division I-AA or I-AAA membership requirements shall be represented on either the Board of Directors or the Management Council so long as that is possible.**"

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

**Rationale:** These provisions require that Divisions I-AA and I-AAA conferences meet appropriate membership criteria in order to be eligible to select Division I-AA or I-AAA representatives. In addition, this will provide greater flexibility for filling Divisions I-AA and I-AAA Management Council representative slots.

**Action:** Part A adopted by Division I, 318-0. Part B adopted by Division I, 324-0.

#### NO. 7-7 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** In Division I, to permit a Board of Directors member's constituent body to select an alternate to attend a meeting when the board member is unable to attend.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part K, by adding a new 4.2.2, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

"4.2.2 Alternate. If a member of a Board of Directors is unable to attend a meeting of the Board of Directors, the constituent body which that member represents shall designate an alternate to attend that meeting. The constituent body shall be that which originally selected the member to the Board of Directors. Each alternate shall be selected on a standing basis by the constituent body and the NCAA shall be notified of this selection. If both the member and the alternate are unable to attend the meeting, the constituent body shall not be represented at that meeting."

**Source:** University of Arizona; Arizona State University; Brigham Young University; University of California, Los Angeles; Colorado State University; University of Hawaii, Manoa; University of New Mexico; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; San Diego State University; University of Southern California; University of Texas, El Paso; U.S. Air Force Academy; University of Washington; Washington State University; and University of Wyoming.

**Rationale:** In a representative system of governance, member institutions may participate in the legislative process only through their selected representatives. If a conference's representative is unable to attend a meeting, the entire conference is penalized by being excluded from participation in the governance process.

Legislative Proposals

A-43



Voting relationships may be affected. It is preferable for the group that selected its representative to name an alternate rather than be absent.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 7-8 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** In Division I, to permit a Management Council member's constituent body to select an alternate to attend a meeting when the Management Council member is unable to attend.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part N, by adding a new 4.5.2, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"4.5.2 Alternate.** If a member of the Management Council is unable to attend a meeting of the Management Council, the constituent body which that member represents shall designate an alternate to attend that meeting. The constituent body shall be that which originally selected the member to the Management Council. Each alternate shall be selected on a standing basis by the constituent body and the NCAA shall be notified of this selection. If both the member and the alternate are unable to attend the meeting, the constituent body shall not be represented at that meeting."

**Source:** University of Arizona; Arizona State University; Brigham Young University; University of California, Los Angeles; Colorado State University; University of Hawaii, Manoa; University of New Mexico; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; San Diego State University; University of Southern California; University of Texas, El Paso; U.S. Air Force Academy; University of Washington; Washington State University; and University of Wyoming.

**Rationale:** In a representative system of governance, member institutions may participate in the legislative process only through their selected representatives. If a conference's representative is unable to attend a meeting, the entire conference is penalized by being excluded from participation in the governance process. Voting relationships may be affected. It is preferable for the group that selected its representative to name an alternate rather than be absent.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 7-9 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To eliminate the authority for Division I-A to act separately and for Divisions I-AA and I-AAA to act together on federated issues unrelated to football.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part Z, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.1.4.3.4 *Separate Voting, Division I Subdivision.* Members of Division I-A and all other Division I members may vote separately on any federated provision (see 5.02.1.4), with the exception of the following:

"(a) Criteria for Division I membership as set forth in 20.9,

"(b) Criteria for Division I sports sponsorship as set forth in 20.9.3;

"(c) Requirements that an institution must meet to be eligible to enter a team or an individual in NCAA championship competition (see 18.4.2);

"(d) Requirements that a conference must meet to be eligible for automatic qualification into any Division I championship (see 18.5);

"(e) Number of grants permitted in basketball per 15.5.4; and

"(f) Personnel and squad limitations for the sport of basketball (see Bylaws 11 and 15).

"5.1.4.3.4.1 *Financial Aid Option.* In sports other than football, an institution that is a member of a Division I subdivision that does not adopt a higher maximum limitation on financial aid per 15.1 may adopt a higher maximum limitation adopted by another Division I subdivision."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part GG, 5.3.2.2.3, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.3.2.2.3 *Separate Voting, Division I Subdivisions.* Members of the Board of Directors or Management Council who are representatives of institutions that are members of Division I-A and those that are representatives of institutions that are other Division I members may vote separately on any federated provision with the exception of the following:

"(a) Criteria for Division I membership;

"(b) Criteria for Division I sports sponsorship;

"(c) Requirements that an institution must meet to be eligible to enter a team or an individual in NCAA championship competition in sports other than football;

"(d) Requirements that a conference must meet to be eligible for automatic qualification into any Division I championship in sports other than football;

"(e) Number of grants permitted in basketball; and

"(f) Personnel and squad limitations for the sport of basketball.

"5.3.2.2.3.1 *Geographical Representation.* An institution classified as a Division I-A independent (e.g., Division I-AA institution that is a member of a conference classified as Division I-AA) shall have its views expressed on Division I-A issues by a predetermined Division I-A conference representative within the institution's geographical region.

"5.3.2.2.3.2 *Financial Aid Option.* In sports other than football, an institution that is a member of a Division I subdivision that does not adopt a higher maximum limitation of financial aid per 15.1 may adopt a higher maximum limitation adopted by another Division I subdivision."

**Source:** All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Mid-Continent, Southland, and Trans America Athletic Conferences.

**Rationale:** In the restructured Association, Division I-A will have a



majority position on the Executive Committee and on the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council. Therefore, it is not necessary to continue to authorize Division I-A to act separately and Divisions I-AA and I-AAA to act together on federated issues unrelated to football.

**Action:** Part A adopted by Division I, 297-28-1. Part B adopted by Division I, 307-12-2.

#### NO. 7-10 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To require notification following subcommittee, committee or cabinet action concerning Division I legislation.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part GG, 5.3.2.2.1, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

“5.3.2.2 Process for Adoption or Amendment of Bylaws

“5.3.2.2.1 Management Council Action. Any change in a division I bylaw shall be subject to initial approval at a meeting of the Division I Management Council by a majority vote of those present and voting. *After initial Management Council approval, notice of the proposed change (including its effective date) shall be sent to the Division I membership for review and comment. At its next regular meeting after the period for membership review and comment (see notification requirements — 5.3.2.4), the Management Council shall consider the reactions and suggestions received and take action on the proposed change. If the proposed change receives a majority vote of those Management Council members present and voting, it shall be forwarded to the Board of Directors for consideration and possible adoption.*”

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part GG, 5.3.2.4, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

[5.3.2.4 unchanged.]

“5.3.2.4.1 Action by Division I Cabinet, Committee or Subcommittee. Proposed changes in Division I legislation that are adopted or rejected by a Division I cabinet, committee or subcommittee shall be published within 30 days of the cabinet's, committee's or subcommittee's action for the information of the membership and to solicit the membership's review and comment. To be considered by the Management Council in its initial review of the legislative change, any comment from the membership shall be received in the national office within 60 days of the date of publication of the cabinet, committee or subcommittee action.”

[5.3.2.4.1 through 5.3.2.4.3 renumbered as 5.3.2.4.2 through 5.3.2.4.4, unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part GG, by adding new 5.3.2.5, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“5.3.2.5 Method of Notification. Notification as required in Bylaw 5.3.2.4 shall be sent to Division I institutions and conferences by first-class mail, by facsimile or by computer-generated communication.”

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

**Rationale:** A representative system of governance requires a fully informed membership to provide conference representatives with timely feedback on legislative issues. This is particularly relevant in Divisions I-AA and I-AAA where conferences are not automatically represented on both Division I governing bodies, and thus, will rely on interconference communication.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I, 323-0-1.

#### NO. 7-11 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To specify that legislative action taken pursuant to Constitution 5.3.2.2.3 is subject to an override vote by a simple majority as opposed to a five-eighths majority.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part GG, 5.3.2.3, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

“5.3.2.3 Membership ‘Override’ of Legislative Changes. The member institutions of Division I may override (e.g., rescind) the adoption of legislation enacted under the procedures set forth in 5.3.2.2.2 and 5.3.2.2.3 or the failure of the Board of Directors to act on or adopt legislation initiated and considered through the legislative process.”

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part GG, 5.3.2.3.3, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

“5.3.2.3.3 **Override Five-Eighths Majority Vote.** At least a five-eighths majority vote of the active Division I members present and voting shall be required to override the legislative action taken by the Board of Directors (or by the Management Council in an area delegated to it) pursuant to 5.3.2.2.2. However, only a simple majority vote of the active Division I members present and voting shall be required to override the legislative action taken by the Board of Directors (or Management Council) pursuant to 5.3.2.2.3.”

**Source:** All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Southern, Southland, and Southwestern Athletic Conferences.

**Rationale:** If the authority for Division I-A to act separately and for Divisions I-AA and I-AAA to act together on federated issues unrelated to football is maintained, it is appropriate to revise the override vote requirement to prevent subdivisional imbalance on



issues that may impact certain constitutional guarantees (e.g., a subdivision dramatically increasing grant-in-aid limits in a particular sport).

**Action:** Moot in Division I.

#### NO. 7-12 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To permit conferences to file requests for an override vote on behalf of their member institutions.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part GG, 5.3.2.3.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.3.2.3.1 Call for an Override Vote. In order to call for a vote to override the adoption of a legislative change or the failure of a legislative change, written requests for such a vote from at least 30 active Division I member institutions with voting privileges must be received in the national office by 5 p.m. Central time 60 days after the official publication to the membership of the legislative action. **In addition, conferences may file such requests for an override vote on behalf of their member institutions. To take such action, a conference must annually submit to the Board of Directors its procedures to ensure that chief executive officers have delegated this authority.** The **override vote** requests must be signed by the institution's chief executive officer, or the chief executive officer's designated representative, **the chair of the conference's official presidential administrative group, or at least two chief executive officers of the conference's member institutions if the conference has no presidential administrative group.**"

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

**Rationale:** In a conference-based governance system, conferences should have the authority to file requests for an override vote on behalf of their member institutions.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I, 320-3.

#### NO. 7-13 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To establish a process to suspend legislation when requests for an override vote are made.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part GG, 5.3.2.3.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"5.3.2.3.1 Call for an Override Vote. In order to call for a vote to override the adoption of a legislative change or the failure of a legislative change, written requests for such a vote from at least 30 active Division I member institutions with voting privileges must be received in the national office by 5 p.m. Central time 60

days after the official publication to the membership of the legislative action. The requests must be signed by the institution's chief executive officer or the chief executive officer's designated representative. **Upon receipt of 100 requests for an override vote, the affected legislation will be suspended until final action (e.g., vote) is taken by the Division I membership.**"

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

**Rationale:** Legislation adopted in Division I that meets such overwhelming objection by the Division I membership should be suspended until final action is taken on the legislation.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I, 311-12.

#### NO. 7-14 NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

**Intent:** To eliminate the process for the designation of an alternate if a member of the Executive Committee is unable to attend a meeting of the Executive Committee.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 7, Part J, 4.1.1.1, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call.]

*"4.1.1.1 Alternate. If a member of the Executive Committee is unable to attend a meeting, the division representatives in the Divisional presidential governing body may designate an alternate from among themselves to attend the Executive Committee meeting."*

**Source:** NCAA Council (Administrative Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1997.

**Action:** Adopted, 762-30-6.

#### NO. 8 RESOLUTION: NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

[Division I only, roll call]

*"Whereas, the Association's current governance system provides Division I subdivisions authority to vote separately on most federated provisions; and*

*"Whereas, the NCAA membership at the 1996 Convention will consider a plan to restructure the Association's governance system; and*

*"Whereas, if adopted, the new governance system will provide Division I-A with a majority position in the NCAA Executive Committee and in the Division I Board of Directors and Management Council; and*



"Whereas, if adopted as proposed, the new governance system continues the authorization for Divisions I-A and I-AA to vote separately on legislative issues pertaining to football and for Division I-A to act separately and for Divisions I-AA and I-AAA to act together on most federated issues unrelated to football; and

"Whereas, if adopted, the new governance system becomes effective August 1, 1997; and

"Whereas, based upon information received by the NCAA Council, there is interest in considering whether Division I-A and Divisions I-AA and I-AAA should continue to have authority to act separately on issues unrelated to football in the restructured Association;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that if the proposed governance system is adopted, the Division I transition team (to be selected February 1996) will review this authority for subdivision separate actions on issues unrelated to football and propose to the NCAA Council for possible sponsorship at the 1997 Convention any legislation it deems necessary regarding this issue."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

**Action:** Not moved in Division I.

#### NO. 9 RESOLUTION: NCAA MEMBERSHIP RESTRUCTURING

[Division I only, roll call]

"Whereas, in 1982 the NCAA assured a minimum of 30 percent representation of women on committees and councils; and

"Whereas, there is no prescribed minimum for gender representation on the Division I Management Council or Division I cabinets/committees set forth in the restructuring proposal (No. 7) or the report of the Division I Task Force to Review Membership Structure; and

"Whereas, there is an absence of a written plan to address Division I gender representation in the restructured NCAA; and

"Whereas, it is essential to assure appropriate gender representation in the restructured NCAA;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Division I restructuring transition team be directed to develop a specific written plan for achieving the stated goals of diversity of representation in a restructured Association and to submit appropriate recommendations to the NCAA Council and Presidents Commission for possible sponsorship of legislation for consideration by the Division I membership at the 1997 Convention."

**Source:** Butler University; Cleveland State University; Indiana State University; Loyola University, Chicago; Northern Illinois University; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; Wichita State University; University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; and Wright State University.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I, 314-4-3.

#### NO. 10 (NO. 2-3)

#### PRINCIPLE GOVERNING FINANCIAL AID

**Intent:** To incorporate into the Association's "Principles for Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics," the principle that the maximum athletics aid an individual student-athlete may receive is the full cost of attendance as defined and published by each institution.

**Constitution:** Amend 2.12, page 5, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]  
"2.12 THE PRINCIPLE GOVERNING FINANCIAL AID

"A student-athlete may receive athletically related financial aid administered by the institution without violating the principle of amateurism, provided the amount does not exceed the cost of education authorized by the Association; **however, such aid as defined by the Association shall not exceed the cost of attendance as published by each institution.** Any other financial assistance, except that received from one upon whom the student-athlete is naturally or legally dependent, shall be prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Association."

**Source:** All members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The maximum amount of athletics aid that an individual can receive should be in the core principle governing financial aid. This amendment does not change the definition of maximum aid as currently defined in Bylaw 15.01.7 and it does not increase or change the current definition of allowable athletics aid. Adoption of this amendment will place the definition of maximum allowable athletics aid as the cost of attendance in the Association's core principles, which means that any future amendment to increase allowable aid beyond the cost of attendance would be subject to a vote of the full membership (one institution, one vote). A restructured NCAA will place more authority in Division I with a "representative form of governance;" however, the basic issue of maximum athletics aid should be a core principle and, as such, remain subject to a vote of the full membership.

**Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism):** The committee agreed to take no position on this proposal; however, the committee suggested that a clarification of the intent and/or rationale statements would be helpful. Specifically, the committee believes that this proposal would be strengthened by elaborating on its objective and explaining how it relates or differs from the existing legislation set forth in NCAA Bylaw 15.01.7.



**Action:** Adopted 660-115-30.

**\*NO. 11 (NO. 2-1) PRINCIPLE OF SPORTSMANSHIP AND ETHICAL CONDUCT**

**Intent:** To amend the principle of ethical conduct to include a reference to sportsmanship, as specified.

**Constitution:** Amend 2.4, page 4, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**"2.4 THE PRINCIPLE OF SPORTSMANSHIP AND ETHICAL CONDUCT**

*"Student-athletes of a member institution and individuals employed by, or associated with, that institution shall deport themselves with honesty and good sportsmanship. Their behavior shall at all times reflect the high standards of honor and dignity that characterize participation in competitive sports in the collegiate setting. For intercollegiate athletics to promote the character development of participants, to enhance the integrity of higher education and to promote civility in society, student-athletes, coaches, and all others associated with these athletics programs and events should adhere to such fundamental values as respect, fairness, civility, honesty and responsibility. These values should be manifest not only in athletics participation but also in the broad spectrum of activities affecting the athletics program. It is the responsibility of each institution to:*

*"(a) Establish policies for sportsmanship and ethical conduct in intercollegiate athletics consistent with the educational mission and goals of the institution; and*

*"(b) Educate, on a continuing basis, all constituencies about the policies in 2.4-(a)."*

**Source:** NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Presidents Commission Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Adoption of this proposal will confirm and emphasize the fundamental importance of the concept of sportsmanship to the Association and its member institutions.

**Action:** Adopted 802-1.

**\*NO. 12 (NO. 2-120) RESOLUTION: SPORTSMANSHIP AND ETHICAL CONDUCT**

[Division I only, roll call]

*"Whereas, all aspects of an institution's athletics program must be conducted in keeping with the principles of sportsmanship and ethical conduct in order for intercollegiate athletics to enhance the integrity of higher education, of which it should be an integral part;*

and

*"Whereas, adherence to the principles of sportsmanship and ethical conduct is best achieved by positive reinforcement of such fundamental values as respect, fairness, civility, honesty and responsibility, through education, rather than proliferation of rules and regulations; and*

*"Whereas, emphasis on these values and adherence to principles of sportsmanship and ethical conduct is important in the preparation of student-athletes for a life characterized by the attributes of a productive and caring citizen; and*

*"Whereas, in order to accomplish these goals, it is the responsibility of institutions to conduct for all their constituencies, on a continuing basis, appropriate educational programs that promote the principles of sportsmanship and ethical conduct; and*

*"Whereas, meaningful reform of intercollegiate athletics cannot be achieved without such intensive efforts to promote adherence to principles of sportsmanship and ethical conduct;*

*"Now, Therefore Be It Resolved, that the NCAA Committee on Athletics Certification be directed to work with the NCAA Presidents Commission Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics to develop legislation for consideration at the 1997 NCAA Convention that will include 'Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct' as a specific component of the athletics certification program, effective in the second five-year cycle of the program.*

**Source:** NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Presidents Commission Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct in Intercollegiate Athletics).

**Action:** Adopted by Division I, 312-5.

**NO. 13 (NO. 2-6) UNETHICAL CONDUCT**

**Intent:** To confirm that the unethical conduct legislation applies to former institutional staff members and that unethical conduct may include offering or providing improper financial aid to prospective or enrolled student-athletes.

**Bylaws:** Amend 10.1, page 49, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

**"10.1 UNETHICAL CONDUCT**

*"Unethical conduct by a prospective or enrolled student-athlete, or an a current or former institutional staff member may include, but is not limited to, the following:*

*[10.1-(a) and 10.1-(b) unchanged.]*

*"(c) Knowing involvement in offering or providing a prospective or an enrolled student-athlete an improper inducement or extra benefit or improper financial aid; or*

*[Remainder of 10.1 unchanged.]*



**Source:** NCAA Council (Committee on Infractions).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal clarifies and confirms that the unethical conduct legislation applies to staff members who may no longer be employed at the institution. In addition, this proposal is consistent with the way the Committee on Infractions has applied this legislation. Unethical conduct should include the offering or providing of improper financial aid to a prospective or enrolled student-athlete.

**Action:** Adopted, 814-5-1.

#### NO. 14 (NO. 2-7) UNETHICAL CONDUCT

**Intent:** To include as unethical conduct the receipt of benefits by an institutional staff member for facilitating or arranging a meeting between a student-athlete and an agent, financial advisor or "runner."

**Bylaws:** Amend 10.1, page 49, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"10.1 Unethical Conduct

"Unethical conduct by a prospective or enrolled student-athlete or an institutional staff member may include, but is not limited to, the following:

[10.1-(a) through 10.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) **Receipt of benefits by an institutional staff member for facilitating or arranging a meeting between a student-athlete and an agent, financial advisor or a representative of an agent or advisor (e.g., 'runner').**"

**Source:** NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The receipt of benefits by staff members for facilitating or arranging meetings between student-athletes and agents, advisors and "runners" apparently occurs with some frequency on campuses. The serious nature of this problem warrants specific legislation under the unethical-conduct bylaw to preclude this activity.

**Action:** Adopted, 817-3-3.

#### NO. 15 (NO. 2-8) ETHICAL CONDUCT — GAMBLING

**Intent:** To prohibit student-athletes from participating in any gambling activities associated with professional sports contests.

**Bylaws:** Amend 10.3, page 49, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote, roll call]

"10.3 GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

"Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution and student-athletes shall not knowingly:

[10.3-(a) through 10.3-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) Participate in any gambling activity that involves intercollegiate athletics **or, for student-athletes only, professional athletics**, through a bookmaker, a parlay card or any other method employed by organized gambling."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** As a matter of policy, the Association opposes all forms of sports wagering because it undermines, or carries the potential to undermine, the integrity of sports contests and sends the wrong message concerning the purpose and meaning of amateur sports. Sports wagering, whether it is on intercollegiate athletics or professional sports, is illegal in every state in the United States, except Nevada. Existing NCAA legislation, which prohibits gambling on intercollegiate athletics, is somewhat neutralized without a companion piece related to professional athletics, because all of the pitfalls related to gambling on intercollegiate sports exist if a student-athlete is permitted to gamble on professional sports. It is appropriate for the NCAA to be proactive in its efforts related to gambling, especially given the recent publicity regarding the widespread nature of this problem on college campuses.

**Action:** Adopted, 614-168-35.

#### \*NO. 16 (NO. 2-4) DIVISION II ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION

**Intent:** In Division II, to specify that once every 10 years an institution shall complete a prescribed institutional self-study, verified and evaluated through an external peer-review process administered by a Division II Committee on Athletics Certification.

**A. Constitution:** Amend 3.2.4 by adding new 3.2.4.8, page 11, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"**3.2.4.8 Athletics Certification — Division II.** To meet the provisions of the athletics certification program of the Association, Division II member institutions shall complete, at least once every 10 years, an institutional self-study, verified and evaluated through external peer review, in accordance with the Association's constitution and bylaws. A Division III institution that sponsors a sport in Division II is not required to participate in the athletics certification program."

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Constitution 3.2.4.7 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

**B. Constitution:** Amend 3.2.5 by adding new 3.2.5.6, page 12, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"**3.2.5.6 Failure to Address Athletics Certification Problems — Division II.** The Division II Committee on Athlet-



ics Certification may place a Division II member institution in a restricted and/or corresponding membership category if it concludes that the institution has not addressed properly the problems identified pursuant to the applicable athletics certification program of the Association."

- C. **Constitution:** Amend 6.01 by adding new 6.01.3, page 45, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"6.01.3 Division II Athletics Certification — Verified and Evaluated Self-Study. The central purpose of the athletics certification program in Division II shall be to validate the fundamental integrity of member institutions' athletics programs through a verified and evaluated institutional self-study.

"6.01.3.1 External Peer Review. The involvement in the certification program of peer reviewers who are external to the institution is designed to verify and evaluate the methodology and results of the institutional self-study. Peer reviewers shall verify that the self-study process was characterized by campus-wide participation and that the self-study report reflects accurately the operation of the athletics program. Peer reviewers also shall evaluate the institution's athletics program in relation to a set of fundamental operating principles."

- D. **Constitution:** Amend 6.3.1 by adding new 6.3.1.2, page 47, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"6.3.1.2 Athletics Certification Requirement — Division II. In Division II, the self-study requirement set forth in 6.3.1 shall consist of the completion of, at least once every 10 years, a prescribed institutional self-study verified and evaluated through external peer review and a self-study (per 6.3.1) conducted at the mid-point between peer reviews. A copy of the interim self-study report must be forwarded to the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification for its review and comment. Subjects per 6.3.1 covered by the self-study shall be grouped as follows:

- "(a) Governance and commitment to rules compliance;
- "(b) Academic integrity;
- "(c) Fiscal integrity; and
- "(d) Commitment to equity.

"6.3.1.2.1 Institutional Plan for Improvement. Each member institution participating in the program shall develop a formal set of objectives de-

signed to correct any deficiencies in the institution's athletics program, and establish an overall strategy for improving the quality of the institution's athletics program from one self-study to the next. When problems are identified pursuant to the certification process, a member institution shall take corrective action. A member institution that fails to conduct an appropriate self-study or to make an effective effort to correct problems identified pursuant to the certification process may be denied certification and ultimately may be placed in restricted and/or corresponding membership classification."

- E. **Bylaws:** Amend 19.6 by adding new 19.6.5, page 350, as follows:  
[Division II only, roll call]

"19.6.5 Recommendation to Division II Committee on Athletics Certification. The Committee on Infractions may recommend to the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification that an institution's certification status be reviewed as a result of the institution's completed infractions case."

- F. **Bylaws:** Amend 23, pages 401-404, as follows:  
[Division II only, roll call]

#### "23.01 GENERAL PRINCIPLE

"The central purpose of the Division II athletics certification program of the Association shall be to validate the fundamental integrity of member institutions' athletics programs through a verified and evaluated institutional self-study. The involvement of peer reviewers external to the institution shall provide the verification and evaluation of the methodology and results of the self-study.

[23.1, with appropriate editorial revisions to reflect the adoption of this legislation, 23.2 and 23.3 with appropriate editorial revisions, unchanged.]

#### "23.4 COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION — DIVISION II

"The Council shall appoint a Division II Committee on Athletics Certification that shall be responsible for administration of the Division II athletics certification program."

"23.4.1 Composition of Committee. The committee shall be composed of a minimum of 10 members and shall include three chief executive officers, two faculty athletics representatives, two athletics administrators, one conference commissioner and two at-large positions. The committee shall include diverse gender and ethnic representation. All members shall be on the staff of a Division II active member institution



or member conference. One of the members shall serve as chair.

**"23.4.2 Duties of Committee.** The duties of the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification shall be as follows:

- "(a) To establish a pool of peer reviewers;
- "(b) After consultation with participating institutions, to select and assign peer-review teams to each institution;
- "(c) To determine the schedule of participating institutions;
- "(d) To modify and refine standards and procedures for the peer-review evaluation visits as necessary;
- "(e) To establish and maintain procedures for the preparation of peer-review team reports and the review-team chair's comments related to an institution's response to the report;
- "(f) To establish and maintain procedures for determining whether intermittent peer-review visits should be conducted as a result of changes in an institution (e.g., new personnel);
- "(g) To determine the certification status of member institutions, per 23.7;
- "(h) To review and recommend changes in the certification cycle if appropriate; and
- "(i) To carry out any other duties directly related to the administration of the Association's athletics certification program.

**"23.4.3 Conflict of Interest.** During the time of their service, committee members shall not individually provide, or be part of a for-profit firm or organization that provides, services in the area of athletics certification.

#### **"23.5 MANDATORY SELF-STUDY AND EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW — DIVISION II**

"Each Division II member institution, at least once every 10 years, shall complete an institutional self-study, verified and evaluated through external peer review. The self-study shall encompass the following operating principles in four basic areas:

##### **"23.5.1 Governance and Commitment to Rules Compliance**

**"23.5.1.1 Institutional Mission.** Maintaining intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program is a basic purpose of the Association. Consistent with this fundamental policy, the mission and goals of the athletics program

shall:

- "(a) Relate clearly to the mission and goals of the institution;
- "(b) Support the educational objectives and academic progress of student-athletes;
- "(c) Support equitable opportunity for all students and staff, including women and minorities;
- "(d) Be reflected in the actual practices of the institution's athletics program; and
- "(e) Appear in published form and be given wide circulation within the institution and made available to its external constituencies.

**"23.5.1.2 Institutional Control.** The Association's principles of institutional control vests in the institution the responsibility for the conduct of its athletics program, including the actions of its staff members and representatives of its athletics interests.

**"23.5.1.3 Presidential Authority, Governing Board.** The institution's governing board shall provide oversight and broad policy formulation. The chief executive officer shall be assigned ultimate responsibility and authority for the actual operation of the athletics program, with clear and direct support of the board.

**"23.5.1.4 Shared Responsibilities.** The athletics program shall be an integral part of the educational enterprise of the institution. As such, appropriate campus constituencies shall have the opportunity to provide input into the formulation of policies relating to the conduct of the athletics program and to scrutinize the implementation of such policies.

**"23.5.1.5 Assignment of Rules-Compliance Responsibilities.** The institution shall have in place a policy and procedure that assigns specific responsibilities in the area of rules compliance.

**"23.5.1.6 Rules-Compliance Accountability.** Rules compliance shall be the subject of an ongoing educational effort, and the commitment to rules compliance shall be a central element in personnel decisions within the department of intercollegiate athletics.

**"23.5.1.7 Conduct of Student-Athletes and Coaches.** Student-athletes and coaches shall deport themselves, both on and off the field of play, in a manner consistent with the principles of NCAA



Bylaw 10 and in such a way as to reflect positively on their institution. The institution shall establish clear standards and appropriate disciplinary measures (including grievance procedures) related to the conduct of its student-athletes and coaches.

**"23.5.2 Academic Integrity.** Since an intercollegiate athletics program is designed to be a vital part of the institution's educational system, student-athletes shall be considered an integral part of the student body.

**"23.5.2.1 Admissions.** The institution shall admit student-athletes consistent with policies governing the admission of students generally. If the academic profile of entering student-athletes differs from that of the student body, the contrast shall reflect clearly established and approved policies and shall be explained by institutional authorities.

**"23.5.2.2 Graduation.** The institution should provide an environment for academic success and graduation. Graduation rates of student-athletes shall be comparable to the graduation rates of students generally. If the graduation rate of student-athletes is significantly lower than that of the rest of the student body, this disparity shall be analyzed, explained and addressed (through specific plans for improvement) by appropriate institutional authorities.

**"23.5.2.3 Academic Authority.** The responsibility for admission, certification of academic standing and evaluation of academic performance of student-athletes shall be vested in the same agencies that have authority in these matters for students generally.

**"23.5.2.4 Academic Support.** Academic support services shall be available for student-athletes comparable to academic services for students generally. Student-athletes shall be encouraged and assisted in reaching attainable academic goals of their own choosing.

**"23.5.2.5 Scheduling.** The scheduling of athletics competition and practice shall minimize conflicts between athletics participation and academic schedules, especially during examination periods.

**"23.5.3 Fiscal Integrity**

**"23.5.3.1 Financial Control.** Institutional financing of intercollegiate athletics shall follow prudent management and fiscal practices. All funds raised

for and expended on athletics shall be subject to generally accepted practices of documentation, review and oversight. In addition, all significant expenditures from any source for athletics shall be approved by the institution.

**"23.5.3.2 Budget and Audit Procedures.** Budget and audit procedures for athletics shall be consistent with those followed by the institution generally and with the provisions of NCAA Constitution 6.2.

**"23.5.4 Commitment to Equity.** Equity is a commitment and a reality where fair distribution of overall athletics opportunities and resources are available to women and men and where no student-athlete, coach or athletics administrator is discriminated against in any way in the athletics program on the basis of gender or race.

**"23.5.4.1 Gender Issues.** An institution shall demonstrate that in the area of intercollegiate athletics, it is committed to establishing an environment where no student-athlete, coach or athletics administrator is discriminated against in any way on the basis of gender. It shall have available adequate information for assessing its current progress in this area and an institutional plan for maintaining equity or for addressing areas of inequity, both of which shall include the allocation of financial resources.

**"23.5.4.2 Minority Issues.** An institution shall demonstrate that in the area of intercollegiate athletics, it is committed to establishing an environment where no student-athlete, coach or athletics administrator is discriminated against in any way on the basis of race. It shall have available adequate information for assessing its current progress in this area and an institutional plan for maintaining equity or for addressing areas of inequity, both of which shall include the allocation of financial resources.

**"23.5.4.3 Student-Athlete Welfare.** The institution shall demonstrate a commitment to the fair treatment of student-athletes, particularly in their academic role as students. There shall be evidence that the welfare of student-athletes and the fairness of their treatment is monitored, evaluated and addressed on a continuing basis."

**"23.6 Certification Decisions.** The Division II Committee on Athletics Certification shall base its decisions regarding the certification of an institution's athletics program on information contained in the institution's self-study



report, the peer-review team's written report, the institution's written response to the review team's report, written comments by the review team in relation to the institution's response, and evidence presented at hearings or in-person appearances before the committee. Actions of the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification regarding an institution's certification status shall be published in The NCAA News.

**"23.6.1 Categories of Certification.** Based on the information presented, the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification shall determine an institution's certification status consistent with the following three categories:

**"23.6.1.1 Certified.** A certified institution shall have been deemed to be in substantial conformity with the operating principles in 23.5.

**"23.6.1.2 Certified with Conditions.** An institution that is certified with conditions shall have been deemed to be in substantial conformity with the operating principles in 23.5, subject to the institution's fulfillment of certain corrective actions in a reasonable, specified period of time. An institution may evidence fulfillment of these corrective actions prior to the time specified by the committee.

**"23.6.1.3 Not Certified.** An institution that is not certified shall have been deemed to be not in substantial conformity with the operating principles in 23.5 and shall be subject to the fulfillment of certain corrective actions in a reasonable, specified period of time. An institution may evidence fulfillment of these corrective actions prior to the time specified by the committee.

**"23.6.2 Postponement of Certification Decision.** The committee reserves the right to postpone the certification decision of an institution when its self-study is deemed to be inadequate (e.g., lacking accuracy, openness or campus-wide participation). If the institution does not respond, it may be placed in restricted-membership status. Such an institution shall not be eligible for certification until an appropriate self-study is completed.

**"23.6.3 Corrective Action.** When problems are identified pursuant to the athletics certification process, a member institution shall take corrective action. Requirements for taking corrective action, and a record of such action, shall be a routine aspect of the certification process and shall be available for review during subsequent certifications.

**"23.6.3.1 Demonstration of Fulfillment of Corrective Action.** The Division II Committee on Athletics Certification shall require institutions to demonstrate that corrective actions identified by the committee have been taken in the specified period of time and upon such a showing, shall grant the institution full certification status.

**"23.6.3.2 Failure to Take Corrective Actions.** An institution that fails to conduct an appropriate self-study or to make an effective effort to correct the problems in its athletics program may be denied certification following the expiration of a reasonable, specified period of time during which the institution may rectify its deficiencies.

**"23.6.3.2.1 Not Certified — Restricted Membership.** If, following the expiration of the time period specified in 23.6.3.2, the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification determines that serious problems remain in the institution's athletics program, the institution shall be placed in a restricted-membership category, consistent with the provisions of 20.3.5.1.

**"23.6.3.2.2 Not Certified — Corresponding Membership.** If, at the end of the restricted-membership year specified in 23.6.3.2.1, the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification concludes that the concerns cited previously related to the institution's athletics department still are not being addressed properly, the institution shall be reclassified as a corresponding member, consistent with the provisions of Constitution 3.5 and Bylaw 20.3.5.1.1.

**"23.6.4 Action on Referrals From Committee on Infractions.** The Division II Committee on Athletics Certification may review and alter an institution's certification status upon referral from the Committee on Infractions per 19.6.5.

**"23.6.5 Appeals.** Following a hearing before the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification, an institution may appeal the decision of the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification pursuant to this section to the Division II Steering Committee (see Bylaw 33 for hearing procedures)."

[23.4 and 23.5 renumbered as 23.7 and 23.8, unchanged.]

G. Bylaws: Amend 33, pages 469-473, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

**"ATHLETICS CERTIFICATION POLICIES AND PROCESSES"**



## DURES

### "33.1 SELF-STUDY AND EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

"The requirements and procedures set forth in this bylaw apply to the institutional self-study and athletics certification process specified in Constitution 3 and 6 and Bylaw 23."

[33.2 through 33.8, with appropriate editorial revisions to reflect the adoption of this legislation, unchanged.]

### "33.9 EXTERNAL PEER-REVIEW TEAMS — DIVISION II

"33.9.1 Function. External peer-review teams shall be responsible for reviewing the institution's self-study report, conducting campus visits and offering comments to the review team's chair. The peer-review team shall approach the institution's self-study report and the campus visit with two objectives:

"(a) To verify that the self-study process involved campus-wide participation, and that the self-study report reflects accurately the operation of the institution's athletics program, and

"(b) To evaluate the institution's performance in relation to the fundamental operating principles specified in 23.5.

"33.9.2 Composition. In Division II, external peer-review teams shall be established to ensure that participating member institutions are evaluated by teams composed of educational and athletics personnel with substantial campus experience. Peer-review teams shall consist of two or three peer reviewers. Peer-review team members shall be appointed by the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification after consultation with participating institutions and shall represent institutions in Division II. One NCAA staff member shall accompany and support each team on evaluation site visits. Any NCAA staff member with a personal relationship or institutional affiliation that reasonably would result in the appearance of prejudice shall refrain from participating in any manner in the involved institution's activities related to athletics certification.

"33.9.3 Selection and Assignment of Peer-Review Teams.

"33.9.3.1 Opportunity of Institution to Review List of Potential Peer Reviews. Prior to the establishment of a peer-review team and the appointment of its chair, an institution shall be given the opportunity to review a list of potential peer reviewers and chairs for purposes of suggesting removal of those who seem inappropriate to the

institution. The authority for establishing the composition of peer-review teams shall rest with the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification.

"33.9.3.2 Establishment of Team. As a general rule, peer-review teams shall be established according to the needs and size of the institution to be reviewed.

#### "33.9.3.2.1 Pool of Peer Reviewers

"33.9.3.2.1.1 Basic Qualifications. To be included in the pool of peer reviewers, an individual shall be from a Division II institution or conference and have recognized expertise, skills or experience in particular areas addressed in the certification program (recent retirees may be included in the pool under special circumstances).

"33.9.3.2.1.2 Women and Ethnic Minorities. The pool of peer reviewers shall include appropriate representation of women and members of ethnic groups.

"33.9.3.3 Conflict of Interest. Former and current employees, consultants or alumni shall not be assigned as peer reviewers to an institution with which they are so affiliated. Further, an individual shall not be allowed to serve as a peer reviewer of an institution that is in the same conference as the individual's conference.

"33.9.3.4 Peer-Review Team Chair. The review team's chair shall be one of the peer reviewers. The chair shall be responsible for preparing the team's written recommendation(s) regarding certification. The recommendation(s) shall be based upon the breadth of institutional participation and the depth of discussion at the institutional level, and adherence to the program's broad operating principles. The review team's chair also shall represent the team before the Committee on Athletics Certification and during appeals hearings.

"33.9.4 Techniques and Documentation Used by Peer-Review Team. The review team shall employ traditional evaluative techniques (e.g., review existing records, conduct in-person interviews of key personnel) to determine whether the institution's stated policies and procedures are engaged and functioning. Three documents also shall be of primary importance in this process:



"(a) The self-study instrument itself, which shall be completed by the institution for review by the external peer-review team;

"(b) A user's guide, which shall assist the institution through the self-study process, with specific attention to appropriate campus involvement and particular topics on which the institution shall focus, and

"(c) Instructions for peer-review teams, to orient team members in their work, including the review of written documents and appropriate topics for discussion in campus interviews.

#### **"33.10 CERTIFICATION SCHEDULE OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS — DIVISION II**

"33.10.1 Determination of Schedule. The Division II Committee on Athletics Certification shall determine the certification schedule, which shall be based on the following principles, insofar as is practicable:

"(a) Institutions from the same conference should be evenly scheduled throughout the certification cycle. Conferences may suggest a schedule for their member institutions.

"(b) Certification should be scheduled in conjunction with the institution's regional accreditation insofar as is possible for those institutions that so desire.

"(c) When the above principles are not operative, procedures of random selection will be utilized.

"33.10.1.1 Certification Schedule for New Division II Members. New Division II members shall be scheduled as soon as practicable after the effective date of their active membership.

"33.10.1.2 Modification of Schedule. An institution may apply to the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification for modification of its place in the schedule upon a showing of special need. The committee shall, at its discretion, revise the schedule if practicable, provided the modification does not extend beyond the certification program's 10-year period in Division II.

"33.10.1.3 Postponement of Certification for Restricted Members or Those Involved in NCAA Investigations. The Division II Committee on Athletics Certification may, at its discretion, delay or postpone the participation of an institution classified in a restricted-membership status or of an institution that is subject to the discontinuation of a sport(s) program(s) as a result of NCAA repeat-violator penalties, when the committee de-

termines it is in the best interests of the Association to do so.

#### **"33.11 SELF-STUDY PROCESS AND REPORT PROCEDURES**

"33.11.1 Time Period for Beginning and Completing Self-Study. Institutions shall be permitted at least one calendar year to complete their certification self-studies and shall be permitted to begin their self-studies at any time.

"33.11.2 Use of Outside Consultants. Institutions shall not be prohibited from using outside consultants in conducting self-studies (e.g., organizing or facilitating an institution's self-study process). However, the institution's own personnel shall be responsible for generating the substance of the self-study report. Peer-review teams shall evaluate institutions on their role in the development of the content of self-study reports.

"33.11.3 Submission of Self-Study Report. Institutions shall be required to submit self-study reports and any supporting documentation to the NCAA staff sufficiently in advance of the evaluation visit. The peer-review team shall perform a preliminary analysis of the report based upon directives or criteria established by the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification. The chair of the peer-review team shall have the authority to determine whether to accept the report. Any decisions to delay the processing of a report shall be made only after consulting with NCAA staff members and with the chair of the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification.

"33.11.4 Confidentiality of Report. Institutional self-study reports shall be treated as confidential by the NCAA, peer-review teams and the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification. Institutions, however, shall be permitted to distribute reports and supporting documentation at their discretion.

"33.12 Orientation — Division II. An institutional representative will be required to attend an orientation session at least one year in advance of the institution's initial scheduled evaluation site visit. The primary purpose of the orientation shall be to discuss with institutional and conference personnel the purpose, process, implications and expectations of the certification program.

#### **"33.13 Peer-Review Evaluation Visit**

"33.13.1 Purpose of Visit. The primary purpose of the evaluation visit shall be to verify and evaluate the institution's self-study report and self-study process.

"33.13.2 Notice of Visit. An institution shall receive no-



tice at least one year in advance of its evaluation visit.

**"33.13.3 Duties of Chair of Peer-Review Team.** The chair of the peer-review team shall be responsible for at least the following duties in conjunction with evaluation visits:

- "(a) Consulting with NCAA staff on arrangements and preparations for evaluation visits;
- "(b) Delegating tasks to be performed during the visit among team members and staff, in accordance with their areas of expertise;
- "(c) Conducting meetings of the visiting team at the end of each day of the visit to summarize findings and to identify remaining tasks to be performed;
- "(d) Meeting with an institution's chief executive officer to discuss informally the nature of the information to be presented in the exit interview;
- "(e) Coordinating and leading the exit interview at the completion of visit;
- "(f) Communicating with the peer-review team following the visit to clarify conclusions for the written report;
- "(g) Ensuring that the peer-review team's report is reflective of the visit's findings and recommendations, and is submitted to the Committee on Athletics Certification following the visit;
- "(h) Communicating with the Committee on Athletics Certification regarding the evaluation visit and peer-review team report, including appearing in person, if necessary, before the committee regarding an institution's certification status;
- "(i) Evaluating the performance of the peer reviewers serving on the teams; and
- "(j) Otherwise ensuring that the team fulfills its responsibilities and the objectives specified for evaluation visits.

**"33.13.4 Exit Interviews.** The entire peer-review team shall participate in an exit interview with the chief executive officer and other individuals invited by the chief executive officer.

**"33.13.5 Rules Violations Discovered During Evaluation Visit.** Possible violations of NCAA rules that relate to the operating principles specified in 23.5 discovered during evaluation visits shall be communicated to the committee, the institution and the conference in the peer-review team's report. The institution shall be reminded of its obligation to self-report violations per Constitution 2.7.1. The institu-

tion's response to these findings shall be a factor in the certification decision.

**"33.13.6 Release of Information Regarding Evaluation Visit.** Until the Committee on Athletics Certification renders its decision, information released regarding evaluation visits shall be limited to statements of the visit's status (i.e., whether the visit has not been made, is in progress or has been completed) and the identities of peer-review team members assigned to the institution. Before the formal assessment, the NCAA, peer-review team and the institution shall not publicize information regarding the visit and shall respond only to inquiries with the public information just described. Following release of the committee's decision, the institution is at liberty to release any information regarding the visit.

#### **"33.14 REPORT OF PEER-REVIEW TEAM**

**"33.14.1 Submission of Report.** The peer-review team's report shall be submitted by the chair of the team to the Committee on Athletics Certification as soon as practicable following the evaluation visit. A copy of the report, excluding the review team's recommendation regarding the institution's certification status, also shall be provided to the chief executive officer of the institution and to the institution's conference.

**"33.14.2 Content of Report.** The peer-review team's report shall include the following:

- "(a) An evaluation of the institution's self-study process as to openness, thoroughness and breadth of participation;
- "(b) An evaluation of the institution's adherence to the certification program's operating principles;
- "(c) A summary of perceived relative strengths and weaknesses in the institution's athletics program; and
- "(d) A recommendation regarding the institution's certification status, based solely upon the information included in the peer-review team's report.

**"33.14.3 Institutional Reaction to Report.** The institution may submit a written reaction to the peer-review report. It shall be sent to the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification (with a copy to the chair of the peer-review team) and shall be limited to correction of factual errors; the presentation of new, relevant information not considered by the team; and proposed corrective actions for remedying deficiencies.

**"33.14.3.1 Response of Peer-Review Team to Institutional Reaction.** If the institution submits a re-



the corresponding ACT or SAT score:

"Core GPA	SAT	SAT recentered	SUMACT
2.750 & above	600	720	59
2.725	610	730	59
2.700	620	730	60
2.675	630	740-750	61
2.650	640	760	62
2.625	650	770	63
2.600	660	780	64
2.575	670	790	65
2.550	680	800	66
2.525	690	810	67

**2.499-2.000 700 & above 820 & above 68 & above"**

**Source:** All members of the Big West Conference; Clemson University; Florida State University; Georgia Institute of Technology; University of Maryland, College Park; University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; North Carolina State University; University of Virginia; and Wake Forest University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** With the adoption of 1995 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 36, as amended, a number of student-athletes who would have been qualifiers under the previous initial-eligibility requirements have been dropped into the status of nonqualifiers. Further, a number of student-athletes who previously were non-qualifiers have been elevated to partial-qualifier status. Many student-athletes who may have attended a high school with strict grading guidelines but have posted respectable ACT or SAT scores may be unfairly categorized as nonqualifiers. This proposal will elevate that group of student-athletes to partial-qualifier status and allow them to receive athletically related financial aid and to practice during their first year in residence. This proposal has no effect on the definition of a qualifier.

**Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):** The committee opposes this proposal, noting its belief that it would be more appropriate to implement the initial-eligibility legislation adopted at the 1995 Convention.

**Action:** Defeated upon reconsideration by Division I, 161-163-6.

#### NO. 20 (NO. 2-55) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — PARTIAL QUALIFIER — DIVISION I

**Intent:** In Division I, to eliminate the opportunity for a partial qualifier to practice during the initial year in residence, and to permit a partial qualifier to earn a fourth season of competition, provided the student meets satisfactory progress at the beginning of the student's fifth academic year.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.2.1.1, page 149, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.2.1.1 Division I. An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who enrolls in a Division I institution and who is a partial qualifier (as defined in 14.02.9.2) may receive institutional financial aid (see 15.02.4.1 and 15.5.1.2.2), including athletically related financial aid, and may practice only on campus or at the institution's regular practice facility but may not **practice or compete** during the first academic year in residence."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.2.4, page 150 as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.2.4 Practice-Session Attendance. A student-athlete who is a **partial qualifier or a nonqualifier** in Division I or a partial qualifier or nonqualifier in Division II and who, therefore, is not eligible for practice may not attend any practice sessions in any capacity, nor may the student-athlete attend any meeting characterized as practice under 17.02.12."

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.4.1, page 150, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.4.1 Division I. A partial qualifier must fulfill an academic year of residence in order to be eligible *to compete and to practice away from the institution* **for practice and competition**. A nonqualifier must fulfill an academic year of residence in order to be eligible for practice, competition and athletically related financial aid (see 14.3.2.2.1). The requirements that must be met to fulfill an academic year of residence are set forth in 14.5.1.2."

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.3 by adding new 14.3.3.1, page 150, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.3.1 **Fourth Season of Competition — Division I — Partial Qualifier.** A fourth season of intercollegiate competition shall be granted to a partial qualifier (per 14.02.9.2), provided that at the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student-athlete's initial full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete fulfills all satisfactory-progress requirements."

**Source:** California State University, Fresno; University of Hawaii, Honolulu; Long Beach State University; University of New Mexico; San Jose State University; University of Texas at El Paso; University of Utah; Utah State University; and University of Wyoming.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal is a compromise between those who feel students failing to meet initial-eligibility standards should be penalized as an incentive to academic preparation in high school and those who feel that partial qualifiers meeting satisfactory-progress requirements in college should be allowed to earn a



fourth year of competition. Current legislation, which permits partial qualifiers to practice as freshmen, but denies a fourth year of eligibility to academically qualified students is unwise and discriminatory. The elimination of practice opportunities for partial qualifiers is both a sound educational policy for admittedly at-risk students and a substantial penalty for failing to meet initial-eligibility requirements. The opportunity to earn a fourth year of competition is both an incentive to progress toward graduation and recognition of acceptable academic performance in college. Combining an initial penalty with subsequent opportunity will serve as an academic incentive to students in high school and in college, as well as enhance graduation rates. Moreover, current legislation creates a de facto "red shirt" year for partial qualifiers. A prohibition on practice will encourage discretion in awarding athletically related financial aid to partial qualifiers.

**Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):**

The committee opposes this proposal, noting that historically it has supported the ability to practice for those students, including partial qualifiers, who meet the sliding-scale index adopted at the 1992 and 1995 Conventions. Many members of the committee also believe that establishing a fourth season of eligibility for a partial qualifier may send the wrong message to prospects regarding the importance of academic preparation.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I, 102-220-6.

**NO. 21 (NO. 2-57) INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY — PARTIAL QUALIFIER — DIVISION I**

**Intent:** In Division I, to permit a partial qualifier to earn a fourth season of competition, provided the student receives a baccalaureate degree prior to the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.3 by adding new 14.3.3.1, page 150, as follows:  
[Division I only, roll call]

**"14.3.3.1 Fourth Season of Competition — Division I — Partial Qualifier. A fourth season of intercollegiate competition shall be granted to a partial qualifier (per 14.02.9.2), provided that at the beginning of the fifth academic year following the student-athlete's initial full-time collegiate enrollment, the student-athlete has received a baccalaureate degree."**

**Source:** All members of the Atlantic 10 Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal represents a compromise that meets the concerns of those who have emphasized raising the initial academic eligibility standards to achieve higher graduation rates and those who believe the criteria used to establish initial aca-

ademic eligibility are not always an accurate indication of a prospect's ability to earn a baccalaureate degree. This proposal permits a student who is able to successfully complete the degree requirements in four calendar years (four academic years and three or four summers) to earn a fourth year of eligibility and, thereby, be able to publicly remove the partial-qualifier stigma that otherwise remains with the student-athlete throughout his or her life. This provides the opportunity for those who have been misguided or have experienced trauma or other negative events in their teenage years to overcome the penalty they have had to deal with as a result of falling into the partial-qualifier status.

**Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):**

The committee opposes this proposal, noting its belief that the establishment of a fourth season of eligibility for a partial qualifier may send the wrong message to prospects regarding the importance of academic preparation. The committee also believes that the affected "pool" of students (partial qualifiers who graduate) may be defined too narrowly.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I, 122-196-2.

**NO. 22 (NO. 2-56) INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY — PARTIAL QUALIFIER — DIVISION II**

**Intent:** In Division II, to permit a partial qualifier to participate in practice activities at the institution during the first academic year in residence.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.2.1.2, page 149, as follows:  
[Division II only, roll call]

**"14.3.2.1.2 Division II. An entering freshman with no previous college attendance who enrolls in a Division II institution and who is a partial qualifier (as defined in 14.02.9.3) may receive institutional financial aid (see 15.02.4.1) based on institutional and conference regulations and may practice only on campus or at the institution's regular practice facility but may not practice or compete during the first academic year in residence."**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.2.4, page 150 as follows:  
[Division II only, roll call]

**"14.3.2.4 Practice-Session Attendance. A student-athlete who is a nonqualifier in Division I or a partial qualifier or nonqualifier in Division II and who, therefore, is not eligible for practice may not attend any practice sessions in any capacity, nor may the student-athlete attend any meeting characterized as practice under 17.02.12."**

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.4.2, page 150, as follows:  
[Division II only, roll call]



action to the peer-review report, the chair of the peer-review team shall be asked to provide the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification with the team's response to the institution's reaction, including the institution's proposed plan for improvement.

#### **"33.15 CERTIFICATION DECISION**

**"33.15.1 Basis of Certification Decision.** The certification decisions of the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification shall be based upon the criteria set forth in 23.6.

**"33.15.2 Appearance of Institutional Representatives.** At the request of the committee, institutional representatives may be asked to appear in person to clarify factual discrepancies and other matters at the time the committee is rendering its certification decision.

**"33.15.3 Request for Hearing.** The committee shall be obligated to honor an institution's request for a hearing related to a decision by the committee regarding the institution's certification status.

**"33.15.4 Announcement of Certification Decision.** The committee, after notifying the institution of its certification decision (and after all appeal opportunities have been exhausted), will publicize the institution's name and the committee's decision regarding the institution's certification status in The NCAA News. While other information related to the peer-review team's report or the Division II Committee on Athletics Certification's actions shall be considered confidential between the institution and the NCAA, the institution may release information regarding the committee's decision at its own discretion."

**H. Bylaws:** Amend 21.3 by adding new 21.3.5, page 385, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

**"21.3.5 Athletics Certification, Division II Committee on.** The Division II Committee on Athletics Certification shall be appointed as provided in 23.4 and its duties assigned as set forth in 23.4.2. (See Bylaws 23 and 33 for details regarding the committee and the Association's procedures related to Division II athletics certification.)"

**I. Bylaws:** Amend 14.8.1.2, pages 169-170, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

**"14.8.1.2 Residence Requirement.** The one-year residence requirement for student-athletes may be waived under the following conditions or circumstances:

[14.8.1.2-(a) through 14.8.1.2-(c), unchanged.]

**"(d) On the recommendation of the Committee on Athletics Cer-**

tification for a student-athlete who transfers to a member institution to continue the student-athlete's opportunity for full participation in a sport because the student-athlete's original institution, per 23.3.3 or 23.6.3, is placed in a membership category that would preclude the institution's team in that sport from participating in postseason competition during all of the remaining seasons of the student-athlete's eligibility."

**Source:** NCAA Presidents Commission and NCAA Council (Special Committee to Study Division II Athletics Certification).

**Effective date:** Part H effective immediately\*; remaining sections effective January 1, 1997.

**Rationale:** Athletics certification is an extension of the current NCAA required self-study. The program provides a realistic opportunity for the institution's larger community to be informed regarding important policy matters in athletics. The involvement of external peer-review teams, composed of experienced campus administrators, will promote campus-wide participation in the institution's self-study and permit an evaluation of the athletics program in terms of fundamental operating principles. These principles are defined broadly to recognize the diversity of member institutions. Certification also will be coordinated with related programs already in place. Required NCAA reports (e.g., enrollment- and persistence-rates, financial audits) form the bulk of requested data. Institutions may request that certification be scheduled in conjunction with regional accreditation (where feasible) to reduce the combined burdens on campus personnel who deal with both kinds of programs. The primary results of athletics certification for each institution should be the establishment of an overall strategy for improving the quality of the athletics program from one self-study to the next and the development of a formal set of objectives designed to correct deficiencies in the institution's athletics program.

**Action:** Motion to refer defeated by Division II, 93-147-4. Immediate effective date for Part H defeated, 115-131-4. Proposal defeated, 73-176-3.

#### **NO. 17 (NO. 2-46) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — DIVISION I**

**Intent:** In Division I, to specify that a qualifier is a student who graduates from high school with a minimum grade-point average of 2.250 in 13 core courses or a student who graduates from high school with a minimum grade-point average of 2.000 in 13 core courses and achieves at least an 800 on the SAT (920 on re-centered SAT; 77 on SUMACT) or 19 on the ACT, and to change the definition of a partial qualifier to a student who presents a cumulative grade-point average of at least 2.000 in 13 core courses.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 14.02.9.2, page 132, as follows:



[Division I only, roll call]

"14.02.9.2 Partial Qualifier — Division I. In Division I, a partial qualifier is a student who does not meet the requirements for a qualifier but who, at the time of graduation from high school, presents a the following core-curriculum grade-point average of at least 2.000 (based on a 4.000 scale) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 13 academic courses per 14.3.1.3. and the corresponding ACT or SAT score:

"Core GPA	SAT	SAT recentered	SUMACT
2.750 & above	600	720	59
2.725	610	730	59
2.700	620	730	60
2.675	630	740-750	61
2.650	640	760	62
2.625	650	770	63
2.600	660	780	64
2.575	670	790	65
2.550	680	800	66
2.525	690	810	67"

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.1, pages 143-144, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.3.1.1 Division I. A qualifier in Division I is defined as one who is a high-school graduate and who presented the following academic qualifications:

"(a) A minimum cumulative grade-point average as specified in 14.3.1.1.1 of **2.250** (based on a maximum 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 13 academic courses per 14.3.1.3, including the following:

"English	4 years
"Mathematics [one year of algebra and one year of geometry (or one year of a higher-level mathematics course for which geometry is a prerequisite)]	2 years
"Natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course, if offered by the high school)	2 years
"Additional courses in English, mathematics, or natural or physical science	1 year
"Social science	2 years
"Additional academic courses [in any of the above areas or foreign language, computer science, philosophy or nondoctrinal religion (e.g., comparative religion) courses]	2 years

"The record of the above courses and course grades must be certified by the initial-eligibility clearinghouse using an official high-school transcript or official correspondence forwarded directly from the high school or upon a high-school transcript forwarded by an institution's admissions office, and **or**

"(b) A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (based on a maximum of 4.000) in a successfully completed core curriculum of at least 13 academic courses per 14.3.1.3, including the following:

"English	4 years
"Mathematics [one year of algebra and one year of geometry (or one year of a higher-level mathematics course for which geometry is a prerequisite)]	2 years
"Natural or physical science (including at least one laboratory course, if offered by the high school)	2 years
"Additional courses in English, mathematics, or natural or physical science	1 year
"Social science	2 years
"Additional academic courses [in any of the above areas or foreign language, computer science, philosophy or nondoctrinal religion (e.g., comparative religion) courses]	2 years

"The record of the above courses and course grades must be certified by the initial-eligibility clearinghouse using an official high-school transcript or official correspondence forwarded directly from the high school or upon a high-school transcript forwarded by an institution's admissions office, and

"(b) A minimum **700 800 (or 920 recentered SAT)** combined score on the SAT verbal and math sections, or a minimum composite score of **17 19 (or 77 SUMACT score)** on the ACT. The required SAT or ACT score must be achieved under national testing conditions on a national testing date [i.e., no residual (campus) testing or regional testing dates].

"14.3.1.1.1 Initial-Eligibility Index. Freshmen may establish eligibility using the following eligibility index.

"Core GPA	SAT	SAT recentered	SUMACT
"2.500 & above	700	820	68
"2.475	710	830	69
"2.450	720	840-850	70
"2.425	730	860	70
"2.400	740	860	71
"2.375	750	870	72
"2.350	760	880	73
"2.325	770	890	74
"2.300	780	900	75
"2.275	790	910	76
"2.250	800	920	77
"2.225	810	930	78
"2.200	820	940	79
"2.175	830	950	80



"2.150	840	960	80
"2.125	850	960	81
"2.100	860	970	82
"2.075	870	980	83
"2.050	880	990	84
"2.025	890	1000	85
"2.000	900	1010	86"

**Source:** All members of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The Association's research, contained in the academic performance study, contains dramatic evidence of the disparate impact on minority student-athletes of both the current initial-eligibility legislation and those requirements scheduled to go into effect in 1996. That research also warns against the use of a conjunctive rule. By relying on test scores, the Association also must be concerned with the demonstrated gender bias of the SAT. The initial-eligibility standards contained in this legislation will place the greater burden on high-school course work rather than on preparing for standardized tests. Student-athletes will be able to exert more control over their eligibility and will have a clearly defined academic goal. Students who do not achieve the required grade-point average will have the opportunity to achieve initial eligibility through a combination of a minimum core-curriculum grade-point average and a minimum test score.

**Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):** The committee opposes this proposal, noting its belief that it would be more appropriate to implement the initial-eligibility legislation adopted at the 1995 Convention.

**Action:** Not moved in Division I.

#### NO. 18 (NO. 2-47) PARTIAL QUALIFIER — DIVISION I

**Intent:** To revise the definition of a partial qualifier to include students who present a core-curriculum grade-point average of 2.500 and an SAT score of 690 (or 810 recentered SAT score) or an ACT score of 17 (or 67 SUMACT score), and to include students who present core-curriculum grade-point averages from 2.475 to 2.250 and SAT scores of 700 (or 820 recentered SAT score) or above or ACT scores of 17 (or 68 SUMACT score) or above.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.02.9.2, page 132, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.02.9.2 Partial Qualifier — Division I. In Division I, a partial qualifier is a student who does not meet the requirements for a qualifier but who, at the time of graduation from high school, presents the following core-curriculum grade-point average and the corresponding ACT or SAT score:

"Core GPA	SAT	SAT recentered	SUMACT
2.750 & above	600	720	59
2.725	610	730	59
2.700	620	730	60
2.675	630	740-750	61
2.650	640	760	62
2.625	650	770	63
2.600	660	780	64
2.575	670	790	65
2.550	680	800	66
2.525	690	810	67
2.500	690	810	67

2.475 to 2.250 700 & above 820 & above 68 & above."

**Source:** University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Florida; University of Kentucky; Louisiana State University; University of Mississippi; Mississippi State University; University of South Carolina, Columbia; and University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The NCAA initial-eligibility legislation that is scheduled to go into effect August 1, 1996, has raised standards to a point where there will be prospects with the necessary academic background to succeed at the collegiate level who will be nonqualifiers. Further, the eligibility standards set to go into effect August 1, 1996, provide only a very narrow definition of a partial qualifier, while increasing the number of nonqualifiers. This proposal will provide more opportunities for a prospect to achieve partial-qualifier status, thus, allowing access to financial aid and practice opportunities.

**Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):** The committee opposes this proposal, noting its belief that it would be more appropriate to implement the initial-eligibility legislation adopted at the 1995 Convention.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I, 150-178.

#### NO. 19 (NO. 2-48) PARTIAL QUALIFIER — DIVISION I

**Intent:** In Division I, to modify the definition of a partial qualifier to include student-athletes who previously would have been qualifiers but now are nonqualifiers based on the adoption of 1995 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 36-A.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.02.9.2, page 132, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.02.9.2 Partial Qualifier — Division I. In Division I, a partial qualifier is a student who does not meet the requirements for a qualifier but who, at the time of graduation from high school, presents the following core-curriculum grade-point average and



"14.3.4.2 Division II. A partial qualifier must fulfill an academic year of residence in order to be eligible *for practice and competition to compete and to practice away from the institution*. A non-qualifier must fulfill an academic year of residence in order to be eligible for practice, competition and financial aid other than that permitted per 14.3.2.2.2. The requirements that must be met to fulfill an academic year of residence are set forth in 14.5.1.2."

**Source:** All members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic and West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conferences; Augustana College (South Dakota); California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; Henderson State University; Lincoln Memorial University; Mankato State University; University of North Dakota; University of Northern Colorado; Northern Kentucky University; Sonoma State University; South Dakota State University; and Texas A&M University-Kingsville.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Division II currently allows a partial qualifier to receive athletically related financial aid during the first year of collegiate enrollment; however, a partial qualifier is not permitted to practice during that year. This is a major disadvantage for Division II institutions and their student-athletes. Division II should alter its current rules related to the practice eligibility of partial qualifiers in order to be consistent with Division I.

**Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):** The committee supports this proposal, noting its belief that the ability to practice on a limited basis can serve as a strong, positive incentive for the academic success of partial qualifiers in Division II.

**Action:** Adopted by Division II, 180-68-1.

#### **NO. 23 (NO. 2-62) TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — PARTIAL QUALIFIER OR NONQUALIFIER — DIVISION I**

**Intent:** In Division I, to specify that a two-year college transfer student in the sport of football or men's basketball who was not a qualifier shall be required to spend one academic year in residence at the certifying institution prior to being eligible for competition, and to maintain the current academic requirements regarding eligibility upon transfer for practice and institutional financial aid in those sports.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.1, pages 160-161, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football,  
divided vote, roll call]

"14.5.4.1 To Division I Institutions

[14.5.4.1.1 unchanged.]

"14.5.4.1.2 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier — **Sports**

**Other Than Football.** A student who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice and competition the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year college, has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms). In addition, such a student must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.5.4.4.3.2).

"14.5.4.1.3 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier — **Football.** In the sport of football, a student who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is not eligible for competition during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution. Such a student is eligible for institutional financial aid and practice the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year college, has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms). In addition, such a student who first enrolled as a regular student in a two-year college after August 1, 1988, must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.5.4.4.3.2)."

[14.5.4.1.2.1 and 14.5.4.1.2.2 renumbered as 14.5.4.1.4 and 14.5.4.1.5, unchanged.]

**B. Bylaw:** Amend 14.5.4.1, pages 160-161, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.5.4.1 To Division I Institutions

[14.5.4.1.1 unchanged.]

"14.5.4.1.2 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier — **Sports Other Than Basketball.** A student who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice and competition the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year college, has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms). In addition, such a student must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.5.4.4.3.2).

"14.5.4.1.3 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier — **Men's Basketball.** In the sport of men's basketball, a student



who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is not eligible for competition during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution. Such a student is eligible for institutional financial aid and practice the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year college, has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms). In addition, such a student who first enrolled as a regular student in a two-year college after August 1, 1988, must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.5.4.4.3.2)."

[14.5.4.1.2.1 and 14.5.4.1.2.2 renumbered as 14.5.4.1.4 and 14.5.4.1.5, unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Academic Requirements and Two-Year College Relations Committees).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a two-year college institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The NCAA enforcement staff and the NCAA Recruiting Committee have provided information indicating that recruiting and academic abuses related to two-year college transfer students occur more frequently in the high-profile sports of football and men's basketball. In addition, transfer students in those sports graduate at rates significantly below those of other transfer student-athletes and transfer students in general. The establishment of a mandatory "redshirt" year would benefit these student-athletes by providing an easier academic transition and requiring them to demonstrate satisfactory progress at the certifying institution.

**Action:** Part A adopted as amended by No. 23-2-A (Division I-A, 82-27-2; Division I-AA, 75-40-3). Part B adopted by Division I as amended by No. 23-2-B, 236-73-7.

#### NO. 23-1 TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — PARTIAL QUALIFIER OR NONQUALIFIER — DIVISION I

**Intent:** In Division I, to maintain the current transfer-eligibility requirements applicable to a two-year college transfer student in the sport of football or men's basketball who was not a qualifier, provided the student has successfully completed at least 40 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 23-A by adding new 14.5.4.1.3.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

**"14.5.4.1.3.1 Exception. A two-year college transfer student who was not a qualifier and who has successfully completed at least 40 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice, and competition during the first academic year in residence if the student has met the requirements of 14.5.4.1.2."**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 23-B by adding new 14.5.4.1.3.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"14.5.4.1.3.1 Exception. A two-year college transfer student who was not a qualifier and who has successfully completed at least 40 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice, and competition during the first academic year in residence if the student has met the requirements of 14.5.4.1.2."**

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

**Rationale:** This amendment will grant relief from the "mandatory redshirt rule" to a student-athlete who has demonstrated significant academic achievement at the two-year college and is on track to complete baccalaureate degree requirements.

**Action:** Moot in Division I.

#### NO. 23-2 TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — PARTIAL QUALIFIER OR NONQUALIFIER — DIVISION I

**Intent:** In Division I, to maintain the current transfer-eligibility requirements applicable to a two-year college transfer student in the sport of football or men's basketball who was not a qualifier, provided the student has successfully completed at least 35 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 23-A by adding new 14.5.4.1.3.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

**"14.5.4.1.3.1 Exception. A two-year college transfer student who was not a qualifier and who has successfully completed at least 35 percent of the course requirements in the student's specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice, and competition during the first**



academic year in residence if the student has met the requirements of 14.5.4.1.2.”

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 23-B by adding new 14.5.4.1.3.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“14.5.4.1.3.1 **Exception.** A two-year college transfer student who was not a qualifier and who has successfully completed at least 35 percent of the course requirements in the student’s specific baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice, and competition during the first academic year in residence if the student has met the requirements of 14.5.4.1.2.”

**Source:** Ball State University; Bethune-Cookman College; Bradley University; California State University, Fresno; California State University, Sacramento; University of Cincinnati; Delaware State University; Florida A&M University; Florida State University; University of Georgia; Idaho State University; Jacksonville University; University of Texas, San Antonio; and Western Kentucky University.

**Rationale:** Nonqualifiers and partial qualifiers who enroll in two-year colleges typically are unable to preselect the university to which they transfer. This makes it difficult for them to successfully complete general education and other university-specific course requirements. Therefore, the 35-percent requirement is more realistic than the 40-percent requirement proposed by the NCAA Council.

**Action:** Part A adopted by Division I-A, 68-46-1; adopted upon reconsideration by Division I-AA, 114-12-1. Part B adopted by Division I, 176-135-6.

**\*NO. 24 (NO. 2-63) TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — PARTIAL QUALIFIER OR NON-QUALIFIER — DIVISION I**

**Intent:** In Division I, to specify that a two-year college transfer student who was not a qualifier shall be limited to using a total of 18 semester or 27 quarter hours of transferable degree credit from summer terms in order to meet transfer-eligibility requirements and that not more than six semester or nine quarter hours of the transferable credit may be earned during the summer term(s) immediately prior to transfer.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.1.2, pages 160-161, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“14.5.4.1.2 **Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier.** A student who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice and competition the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year col-

lege, has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms). **Not more than a total of 18 semester or 27 quarter hours of the transferable degree credit may be earned during summer terms, and not more than six semester or nine quarter hours of the transferable degree credit may be earned during the summer term(s) immediately prior to transfer.** In addition, such a student must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.5.4.4.3.2).”

[Remainder of 14.5.4.1.2 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Academic Requirements and Two-Year College Relations Committees).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering the certifying institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The proposed limit on the use of credit hours earned during the summer will ensure that student-athletes do not use an unreasonable number of summer hours in order to meet two-year college transfer requirements. Often, student-athletes who attend two-year colleges that require the successful completion of an “exit examination” to earn an associate of arts degree (e.g., two-year colleges in Florida and Texas) and who are not able to pass those exams, transfer most or all of their credits to a two-year college in another state that permits the student-athlete to receive an associate degree by completing a significant amount of summer course work.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 24-1 and 24-2, 300-20.

**NO. 24-1 TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — PARTIAL QUALIFIER OR NONQUALIFIER — DIVISION I**

**Intent:** In Division I, to specify that a two-year college student who was not a qualifier may earn not more than nine semesters or 12 quarter hours of transferable degree credit during the summer term(s) immediately prior to transfer.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 24, 14.5.4.1.2, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“14.5.4.1.2 **Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier.** A student who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice and competition the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year college, has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student from



at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms). Not more than a total of 18 semester or 27 quarter hours of the transferable degree credit may be earned during summer terms, and not more than ~~six~~ **nine** semester or ~~nine~~ **13.5** quarter hours of the transferable degree credit may be earned during the summer term(s) immediately prior to transfer. In addition, such a student must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.5.4.4.3.2)."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Two-Year College Relations Committee).

**Rationale:** Inasmuch as many student-athletes wait until the summer prior to transfer to decide which school to attend, the nine semester/13.5 quarter-hour limit is reasonable. The timing of this decision may require student-athletes to complete additional work during that summer.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I, 262-54-1.

**\*NO. 24-2 TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS—PARTIAL QUALIFIER OR NONQUALIFIER—DIVISION I**

**Intent:** In Division I, to specify that the limits on transferable summer hours that may be used to establish the eligibility of a two-year college transfer student who was not a qualifier shall not apply until August 1, 1997 (for those student-athletes first entering the certifying institution on or after August 1, 1997).

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.1.2, pages 160-161, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.5.4.1.2 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier. A student who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is eligible for institutional financial aid, practice and competition the first academic year in residence only if the student has graduated from the two-year college, has completed satisfactorily a minimum of 48 semester or 72 quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution and has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least three semesters or four quarters (excluding summer terms). Not more than a total of 18 semester or 27 quarter hours of the transferable degree credit may be earned during the summer term(s) immediately prior to transfer. In addition, such a student must have a cumulative grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.5.4.4.3.2)."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

**Effective Date:** *August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering the certifying institution on or after August 1, 1996* **August 1, 1997; for those student-athletes first entering the certifying institution on or after August 1, 1997.**

**Action:** Adopted by Division I, 251-62-3.

**\*NO. 25 (NO. 2-66) ACADEMIC DEGREE REQUIREMENTS — TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — DIVISION I**

**Intent:** In Division I, to specify that for partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers, at least 40 percent of the credit hours needed to fulfill the academic degree requirements of a two-year college transfer student must be earned at the two-year college that awards the degree.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.4.1, pages 161-162, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.5.4.4.1 Multiple Two-Year Colleges. When a student-athlete has been in residence at two or more two-year colleges, the terms of residence at all two-year colleges may be combined in order to satisfy the residence requirement. All grades and all course credits that are transferable from the two-year colleges to the member institution shall be considered in determining the student-athlete's eligibility under 14.5. In addition, **for qualifiers, at least 25 percent and for partial qualifiers and non-qualifiers, at least 40 percent**, of the credit hours used to fulfill the student's academic degree requirements must be earned at the two-year college that awards the degree per 14.5."

**Source:** NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Academic Requirements and Two-Year College Relations Committees).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a two-year collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Increasing the current 25-percent requirement to 40 percent will ensure that a student-athlete who was a partial qualifier or a nonqualifier has completed successfully a significant portion of degree credit at the two-year college that is awarding the student's associate of arts degree. It will preclude a student from earning necessary degree hours by attending only one term at the two-year school awarding the degree.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

**NO. 25-1 ACADEMIC DEGREE REQUIREMENTS — TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — DIVISION I**

**Intent:** In Division I, to specify that for partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers in the sports of football and men's basketball only, at least 40 percent of the credit hours needed to fulfill the academic degree requirements of a two-year college transfer student must be earned at the two-year college that awards the degree.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 25, 14.5.4.4.1, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote, roll call]

"14.5.4.4.1 Multiple Two-Year Colleges. When a student-athlete has been in residence at two or more two-year colleges, the terms of



residence at all two-year colleges may be combined in order to satisfy the residence requirement. All grades and all course credits that are transferable from the two-year colleges to the member institution shall be considered in determining the student-athlete's eligibility under 14.5. In addition, for qualifiers **in the sport of football**, at least 25 percent and for partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers **in the sport of football**, at least 40 percent, of the credit hours used to fulfill the student's academic degree requirements must be earned at the two-year college that awards the degree per 14.5."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 25, 14.5.4.4.1, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"14.5.4.4.1 Multiple Two-Year Colleges. When a student-athlete has been in residence at two or more two-year colleges, the terms of residence at all two-year colleges may be combined in order to satisfy the residence requirement. All grades and all course credits that are transferable from the two-year colleges to the member institution shall be considered in determining the student-athlete's eligibility under 14.5. In addition, for qualifiers **and partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers in sports other than football and men's basketball at least 25 percent and for partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers in the sport of men's basketball**, at least 40 percent, of the credit hours used to fulfill the student's academic degree requirements must be earned at the two-year college that awards the degree per 14.5."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Two-Year College Relations Committee).

**Rationale:** Evidence indicates that the most significant recruiting and academic abuses involving two-year college transfers occur in football and men's basketball. This proposal will directly affect those sports without affecting other sports.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

**\*NO. 26 (NO. 2-64) TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS — PARTIAL QUALIFIER OR NON-QUALIFIER — DIVISION II**

**Intent:** In Division II, to specify that a two-year college transfer student who was not a qualifier and who has not graduated from the two-year college shall have completed successfully an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of transferable degree credit for each semester/quarter of full-time attendance at the two-year college in order to fulfill transfer-eligibility requirements.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.2, page 161, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"14.5.4.2.2 Partial Qualifier or Nonqualifier. A transfer student from a two-year college who was not a qualifier (per 14.3.1.1) is eligible in Division II institutions for practice and competition (and for nonqualifiers, for athletics aid) during the first academ-

ic year in residence only if the student has attended a two-year college as a full-time student for at least two semesters or three quarters and has:

"(a) Graduated from the two-year college, or

"(b) Presented a minimum of 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of transferable degree credit with a cumulative minimum grade-point average of 2.000 (see 14.5.4.4.3.2) **and satisfactorily completed an average of at least 12 semester or quarter hours of transferable degree credit acceptable toward any baccalaureate degree program at the certifying institution for each academic term of full-time attendance at the two-year college.**"

**Source:** NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Division II Steering Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a two-year collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal will increase the minimum amount of transferable degree credit for a nonqualifier/partial qualifier who transfers from a two-year college to a Division II institution and will help ensure the student's academic success at the Division II institution.

**Action:** Adopted by Division II, 172-74.

**\*NO. 27 (NO. 2-67) TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFER — CORRESPONDENCE COURSES**

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II, to preclude the use of correspondence courses to satisfy the transferable-degree-credit component of the two-year college transfer-eligibility requirements.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.4.3, page 162, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote, roll call]

"14.5.4.4.3 Determination of Transferable Degree Credit. For the purpose of determining transferable degree credit, the institution may count those courses accepted as degree credit in any of its colleges, schools or departments, **except that correspondence courses shall not be used.**"

**Source:** NCAA Council and NCAA Presidents Commission (Academic Requirements and Two-Year College Relations Committees).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for correspondence courses taken during the 1996-97 academic year and thereafter.

**Rationale:** Many two-year college transfer student-athletes are completing a significant amount of necessary course work via correspondence. Such correspondence course work appears to be especially subject to abuse, as illustrated in a recent Federal court case (i.e., U.S. vs. Johnston, et al.) and various media reports, and this proposal would prohibit the use of such courses.



**Action:** Referred by Division I to Academic Requirements and Two-Year College Relations Committees, 257-57. Not moved in Division II.

## NO. 28 (NO. 2-71) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I

*[Note: The NCAA Council has submitted the following proposal for consideration by the Division I membership. While the Council does not support the proposal, it believes the membership should have an opportunity to vote on this proposal.]*

**Intent:** In Division I, to require that institutional aid awarded beyond the value of tuition and fees and required course-related books be awarded on the basis of a student-athlete's demonstrated need as determined by a central processing agency utilizing federal methodology; to permit student-athletes to receive institutional financial aid up to the cost of attendance; to redefine the value of a full grant-in-aid; to alter the calculation of equivalency values as specified, and to permit a Division I student-athlete to receive academic honor awards without affecting the student-athlete's equivalency calculation."

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.5.1, page 183, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"15.02.5.1 Divisions I and II. In Division I, a full grant is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees and required course-related books. In Division II, a full grant-in-aid is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books."**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02, by adding new 15.02.7, page 184, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"15.02.7 Need-Analysis Assessment Center. A Division I institution shall utilize a needs-analysis assessment center approved by the Council to determine each student-athlete's Expected Family Contribution (EFC) based upon the student-athlete's demonstrated financial need as calculated by federal methodology."**

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.2, pages 185-186, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"15.2.2 Room and Board. An institution may provide a student-athlete financial aid that includes the cost of room and board, based on the official allowance for room and board as listed in the institution's official publication (e.g., catalog) provided that in Division I, the room and board payments are based upon the student-athlete's demonstrated need as calculated by federal methodology (see 15.02.7)."**

[Remainder of 15.2.2 unchanged.]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.7.1, page 189, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"15.2.7.1 General Stipulations. A student-athlete who is eligible for institutional financial aid during the summer is not required to be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies. However, the student-athlete may not receive financial aid that exceeds the cost of a full grant-in-aid for attendance in that summer term. In Division I, a student-athlete may receive institutional financial aid beyond the value of tuition and fees and books during the summer, provided the receipt of such aid is based on the student-athlete's demonstrated need as calculated by federal methodology."**

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.3.3, pages 200-201, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"15.5.3.3 Equivalency Computations. In equivalency sports, each institutional financial aid award (per 15.02.4.1) to a counter shall be computed as follows:**

**"(a) Once a student becomes a counter, the institution shall count all institutional aid (per 15.02.4.1) received for room, board, tuition and fees, as well as books (which shall count for calculation purposes as \$200 in the denominator and, if they are provided or their cost covered by the institution, as \$200 in the numerator, regardless of the actual amount received). Exempted government grants per 15.2.4 and exempted institutional aid per 15.02.4.3 specifically are excluded from this computation.**

**"(b) A fraction shall be created, with the amount received by the student-athlete as the numerator and the full grant-in-aid value for that student-athlete (i.e., tuition, fees and books) as the denominator based upon the actual cost or average cost of a full grant for all students at that institution.**

**[15.5.3.3-(c) unchanged.]**

**"15.5.3.3.1 Exception. Academic honor awards that meet the following criteria are exempt from a Division I or II institution's equivalency computation:"**

**[Remainder 15.5.3.3 unchanged.]**

**Source:** NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1997; for student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1997.

**Rationale:** As a result of the adoption of 1994 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 16-1 (Resolution: Need-Based Financial Aid), the NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism was directed to study the feasibility of a need-based aid system and submit appropriate legislation for the membership's consideration at the 1996 Convention. This proposal represents the committee's best effort at proposing an equitable system. Such a system would afford Division I institutions the opportunity to save significant amounts of money. Additionally, research has shown that the



proposed system would not disproportionately affect either gender group and/or any racial group. Under such a system, student-athletes in head-count sports would be more affected than those student-athletes who participate in equivalency sports, given the fact that at the Division I level, most head-count sports are fully funded. The Council realizes that the overall climate in intercollegiate athletics has significantly changed since the committee was given its original charge back in 1994; however, the Council, while not supporting the proposal, believes that the Division I membership should have a chance to vote on the concept of need-based aid.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I, 61-290-9.

#### NO. 28-1 FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I

**Intent:** To specify that a student-athlete's receipt of supplies, transportation allowances and miscellaneous expenses from the institution shall be based on the student-athlete's demonstrated need as calculated by federal methodology.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 28 by adding new Part C, 15.2.8, relettering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"15.2.8 Supplies, Transportation Allowances and Miscellaneous Expenses. A Division I student-athlete's receipt of supplies, transportation allowances and miscellaneous expenses from the institution shall be based on the student-athlete's demonstrated need as calculated by federal methodology."**

**Source:** NCAA Council (Financial Aid and Amateurism Committee).

**Rationale:** A student-athlete's receipt of supplies, transportation allowances and miscellaneous expenses from the institution should be based on demonstrated need, consistent with the receipt of room and board.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I, 139-178-13.

#### NO. 29 RESOLUTION: FINANCIAL AID IN DIVISION II

[Division II only, roll call]

*"Whereas, it is the sense of the membership that some means must be found to reduce the costs of Division II intercollegiate athletics and/or reallocate funding to develop or enhance new athletics programs and that this must be accomplished without denying students access to higher education or significantly altering the competitive balance among Division II member institutions; and*

*"Whereas, based on the input received by the NCAA Special Committee to Review Financial Conditions in Intercollegiate Athletics, the Financial Aid and Amateurism Committee and various groups that have sponsored financial aid legislation at various Con-*

*ventions, there is interest in considering alternative financial aid models for Division II athletics; and*

*"Whereas, proposed models have varied, including the revision of current limits on athletics grants under the current financial aid structure, various tuition and fee models, and the possible subdivision in particular sports with different scholarship limits in those divisions; and*

*"Whereas, the various constituent groups (e.g., NCAA Division II Steering Committee, Division II Subcommittee of the NCAA Presidents Commission, the Financial Aid and Amateurism Committee and member institutions) are not in general agreement as to the best alternative models or whether new financial aid models are needed; and*

*"Whereas, there has been and likely will continue to be an influx of NAIA institutions applying for membership into the NCAA that will continue to alter the makeup of the Division II membership; and*

*"Whereas, restructuring could further alter the general makeup of the Division II membership;*

*"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Division II restructuring transition team study and evaluate the issue of financial aid in Division II if the restructuring proposal is adopted at the 1996 Convention, or if the restructuring proposal fails, the NCAA Division II Steering Committee shall conduct such a study; and*

*"Be It Further Resolved, that the Division II transition team and/or the Division II Steering Committee be directed to make a progress report at the 1997 Convention; including whether appropriate legislation for an alternative model or adjustments to the current financial aid model will be proposed to the Division II membership not later than the 1998 Convention.*

**Source:** All members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic and West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conferences.

**Action:** Adopted by Division II, 192-52.

#### NO. 30 (NO. 2-70) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION II

**Intent:** In Division II, to permit a student-athlete in specific sports to receive financial aid up to the cost of attendance as determined by the Federal Needs Analysis Methodology; to limit to the cost of tuition, fees and books the amount of institutional athletics aid a student-athlete may receive without demonstrating need or qualifying for an honorary academic award; to calculate equivalencies based on the value of countable aid received by the student-athlete divided by the value of tuition, fees and books for the student-athlete, and to establish new equivalency limits in selected Division II sports and to charge a subcommittee of the NCAA Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism Committee with reviewing and approving the professional judgment of the campus financial aids director for and Division II student-athlete who received athletically related financial aid.



**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.4.3, page 183, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"15.02.4.3 Exempted Institutional Financial Aid. The following institutional financial aid is exempt and is not counted in determining a student-athlete's full grant-in-aid or in the institution's financial aid limitations:

"(a) An honorary award for outstanding academic achievement or an established institutional research grant that meets the criteria set forth in 15.02.6 (and in Divisions I, II and III must be included in determining if the student-athlete's cost of attendance has been met);"

[Remainder of 15.02.4.3 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.5, page 183, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"15.02.5 Full Grant-in-Aid

"15.02.5.1 Divisions I and II. A full grant-in-aid is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books.

"15.02.5.2 Division II

"15.02.5.2.1 Division II Championship Sports. In the Division II sports set forth in 15.5.3.2.1 and 15.5.3.2.2, aid based on athletics ability shall not exceed the value of tuition, fees and books, and all other institutional aid shall be based on need and shall not exceed the cost of attendance.

"15.02.5.2.2 Other Division II Sports. A full grant-in-aid in the Division II sports set forth in 15.5.3.2.3 is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books."

[15.02.5.2 renumbered as 15.02.5.3, unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.6, pages 183-184, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"15.02.6 Honorary Academic Award/Research Grant. An honorary academic award for outstanding academic achievement or a research grant is an award that meets the following criteria:

[15.02.6-(a) through 15.02.6-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) In Divisions I, II and III, the award or grant is included in determining if the student-athlete's cost-of-attendance limitation has been met."

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.3.2, page 200, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"15.5.3.2 Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits

"15.5.3.2.1 Division II Men's Sports. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) **tuition, fees and books (fees must be general or course related)** that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each Division II men's sport as follows:

"Baseball.....	9.0	13.0	Lacrosse.....	10.8	15.0
"Basketball.....	10.0	12.0	Rifle.....	3.6	
" <b>Cross Country only</b> .....	<b>6.0</b>		Skiing.....	6.3	
"Cross Country/Track...12.6	16.0		Soccer.....	9.0	14.0
"Fencing.....	4.5		Swimming.....	8.1	12.0
"Football.....	36.0	42.0	Tennis.....	4.5	6.0
"Golf.....	3.6	6.0	Volleyball.....	4.5	
"Gymnastics.....	5.4		Water Polo.....	4.5	
"Ice Hockey.....	13.5	16.0	Wrestling.....	9.0	13.0

"15.5.3.2.1.1 Overall Limit. A Division II institution shall not provide more than an equivalent of 60 total awards in all men's sports other than football and basketball in any academic year.

"15.5.3.2.2 Division II Women's Sports. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) **tuition, fees and books (fees must be general or course related)** that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each Division II women's sport, as follows:

"Archery.....	5.0	Lacrosse.....	9.9
"Badminton.....	8.0	Skiing.....	6.3
"Basketball.....	10.0	Soccer.....	9.9
"Bowling.....	5.0	Softball.....	7.2
"Crew.....	20.0	Squash.....	9.0
" <b>Cross Country only</b> .....	<b>6.0</b>	Swimming.....	8.1
"Cross Country/Track...12.6	16.0	Synchronized Swimming.....	5.0
"Fencing.....	4.5	Team Handball.....	12.0
"Field Hockey.....	6.3	Tennis.....	6.0
"Golf.....	5.4	Volleyball.....	8.0
"Gymnastics.....	6.0	Water Polo.....	8.0
"Ice Hockey.....	18.0		

"15.5.3.2.3 Division II Exception — National Collegiate Championship and Emerging Sports. In accordance with the provisions of 18.4.2.3.1, a Division II institution may exceed the Division II maximum awards limitations in a sport in which only one NCAA championship is conducted. **There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards [per 15.02.4.1 (i.e., tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books)] that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following sports that compete for National Collegiate Championships (per 18.3.1) or that are emerging sports for women (per 20.02.5):**

Men's Sports		Women's Sports	
"Fencing.....	4.5	Archery.....	5.0
"Gymnastics.....	5.4	Badminton.....	8.0
"Rifle.....	3.6	Bowling.....	5.0
"Skiing.....	6.3	Crew.....	20.0
"Volleyball.....	4.5	Fencing.....	4.5
"Water Polo.....	4.5	Gymnastics.....	6.0
		Ice Hockey.....	18.0
		Lacrosse.....	9.9
		Skiing.....	6.3



Squash .....	9.0
Synchronized Swimming .....	5.0
Team Handball .....	12.0
Water Polo .....	8.0

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.3.3, pages 200-201, as follows:

[Division II only, roll call]

"15.5.3.3 Equivalency Computations. In equivalency sports, each institutional financial aid award (per 15.02.4.1) to a counter shall be computed as follows:

[15.5.3.3-(a) through 15.5.3.3-(c) unchanged.]

**"15.5.3.3.1 Exception for Division II Sports Limited to Tuition, Fees and Books.** In selected sports in Division II (per 15.5.3.2.1 and 15.5.3.2.2), a fraction shall be created with the amount of all countable aid received by the student-athlete as the numerator and the full cost of tuition, fees and books [book value calculation the same as 15.5.3.3-(a)] for that student-athlete as the denominator, based upon the actual or average cost of tuition, fees and books for all students at that institution. The sum of all fractional and maximum awards received by counters shall not exceed the total limit for the sport in question for the academic year as a whole.

**"15.5.3.3.1.1 Countable Aid.** For purposes of calculating equivalencies (per 15.5.3.3.2), countable aid includes all financial aid not based on need (athletics and nonathletics), except for exempted financial aid set forth in 15.02.4.3 and 15.5.3.3.1."

[15.5.3.3.1 renumbered as 15.5.3.3.2, unchanged.]

**F. Bylaws:** Amend 21.3.13, page 388, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote, roll call]

"21.3.13 Financial Aid and Amateurism, Committee on

[21.3.13.1 and 21.3.13.1.1 unchanged.]

"21.3.13.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for review and consideration of those portions of the Association's constitution and bylaws that relate to principles governing financial aid and amateurism. **In addition, a subcommittee of the committee shall be charged with reviewing and approving the professional judgment of a campus financial aid director for any Division II student-athlete who receives athletically related financial aid (athletics grant in aid). The local campus financial aid director shall continue to perform professional judgment decisions but they shall not become official until reviewed and approved by the subcommittee.**"

**Source:** All members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1997; for those student-athletes first entering an NCAA institution on or after August 1, 1997.

**Rationale:** A tuition, fee and book athletics scholarship equivalency

plan provides a method by which many institutions may contain costs and reallocate funding to develop or enhance new athletics programs. Tuition, fees and books scholarship equivalencies would be used in Division II sports where there is a Division II championship. Those sports that are classified as National Collegiate Championship sports or emerging sports would continue to use current grant-in-aid equivalencies until there is a separate championship for that sport in Division II. This is because some Division II institutions would have to play against Division I institutions in National Collegiate Championship sports or emerging sports. A four-year period before the legislation becomes effective is provided to protect student-athletes who entered under the previous scholarship regulations and to provide adequate time for institutions to adjust to these proposed changes. Many Division II institutions believe there is a need to pursue this issue sooner rather than later in order to provide financial savings as quickly as possible.

**Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism):** The committee opposes this proposal for three major reasons: (1) The committee believes that the proposal should not contain increases in grant limits. Under the proposal, the value of the full grant would decrease but considerable increases in the maximum grant-in-aid limits for most sports would offset much of the cost savings expected; (2) the committee is concerned about the proposal's effective date in that it does not afford a phase-in period. Consequently, student-athletes who may have started their intercollegiate careers under one financial aid system may have their awards drastically altered as upper classmen due to the need-based aid guidelines; and (3) the committee noted that there is no provision within this proposal to assure consistency in the determination of a student-athlete's demonstrated need. The committee's model contains two alternatives related to the calculation of a student-athlete's Expected Family Contribution (EFC) upon which the student-athlete's eligibility for need-based aid shall be based (i.e., the use of a central processing entity; or, the use of the Federal Needs Methodology with the establishment of a special NCAA committee to review appeals from institutions to modify a student-athlete's needs assessment for special or unusual circumstances). The committee agreed to change its stance to "no position" if the sponsors modified the proposal in these three areas.

*[Note: The proposal was modified by the sponsors to specify that a subcommittee of the financial aid committee is charged with reviewing and approving the professional judgment of a campus financial aid director for any division II student-athlete who receives athletically related financial aid.]*

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division II.

**NO. 31 (NO. 2-72) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I  
EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS**

**Intent:** To permit Division I student-athletes to exempt legitimate



on- or off-campus employment earnings from their full grant-in-aid limit, provided the employment occurs during the nontraditional or out-of-season segment of the playing season in the student-athlete's sport and neither the institution's athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.1.1, page 184, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.4.1) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included:

"(a) Employment. Employment during semester or term time (which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing of classes of the regular semester, quarter or term, except for vacation periods listed in the institution's official calendar), except for **the legitimate on- or off-campus employment of Division I student-athletes per 15.2.6.1** and the legitimate off-campus employment of Division II student-athletes (also see 15.2.6)."

[Remainder of 15.1.1 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.6 by adding new 15.2.6.1, page 189, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Divisions I only, roll call]

**"15.2.6.1 Exception — Division I Employment Earnings.** Earnings from a Division I student-athlete's legitimate on- or off-campus employment earned during either the nontraditional or out-of-season segment of the playing season of the student-athlete's sport shall be exempt, provided neither athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment. Earnings from such employment with a representative of the institution's athletics interests may be exempted, provided the student-athlete secures the employment in the same manner as other members of the general public. Limitations on employment earnings shall be subject to institutional regulations applicable to all students."

**Source:** All members of the Big Ten Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This amendment would allow a student-athlete to exempt from his or her full grant-in-aid any income that is earned during the off-season. This proposal attempts to address the unmet financial needs of student-athletes by expanding the opportunity for student-athletes to retain employment earnings. To simplify monitoring of and compliance with the legislation, the limits on employment earnings would be the same limits appli-

cable to any other student at the institution who is subject to scholarship requirements. Consistent with the existing legislation in Division II, the involvement of the athletics department staff and/or representatives of an institution's athletics interests is precluded. Additionally, only income from employment that occurs during the nontraditional segment or off-season in the student-athlete's sport can be exempted in order to respond to concerns related to student-athlete time demands.

**Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism):** The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I, 120-198-6.

**NO. 32 (NO. 2-73) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I  
EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS**

**Intent:** To permit Division I student-athletes to earn up to \$1,500 in legitimate on- or off-campus employment income in excess of a full grant-in-aid, provided the institution's athletics department staff members and/or representatives of the institution's athletics interests are not involved in arranging the employment.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.1.1, page 184, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.1.1 Types of Aid Included in Limit. In determining whether a student-athlete's financial aid exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, all institutional financial aid (per 15.02.4.1) and all funds received from the following and similar sources shall be included:

"(a) Employment. Employment during semester or term time (which is an all-inclusive period from the opening to the closing of classes of the regular semester, quarter or term, except for vacation periods listed in the institution's official calendar), except for **\$1,500 in earnings from the legitimate on- or off-campus employment of Division I student-athletes per 15.2.6.1** and the legitimate off-campus employment of Division II student-athletes (also see 15.2.6)."

[Remainder of 15.1.1 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.6.1, page 189, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"15.2.6.1 Exception — Divisions I and II Employment Earnings.** Earnings from a Division II student-athlete's legitimate off-campus employment, and up to \$1,500 in earnings from a Division I student-athlete's legitimate on- or off-campus employment, in excess of a full grant-in-aid shall be exempt, provided neither athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment. Earnings from such employment by a representative of the institution's athletics interests may be exempted, provided the student-athlete secures the employment in the



same manner as other members of the general public.”

**Source:** All members of the Big West Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Many student-athletes from lower- and middle-class families often have difficulty meeting financial needs during the academic year. Student-athletes should be permitted to earn legitimate income in excess of a full grant-in-aid. This proposal would allow a Division I student-athlete to work during the academic year and have up to \$1,500 of the employment earnings not count against the student-athlete's individual limit of a full grant-in-aid, provided neither athletics department staff members nor representatives of the institution's athletics interests are involved in arranging the employment.

**Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism):** The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 33 (NO. 2-74) FINANCIAL AID — PELL GRANTS — DIVISION I

**Intent:** In Division I, to specify that a Pell Grant shall not be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid for a student-athlete.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.4, pages 186-187, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

“15.2.4 Government Grants. Government grants for educational purposes shall be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid for a student-athlete, except for those listed in 15.2.4.1 and 15.2.4.2.

“15.2.4.1 Pell Grants. A student-athlete may receive a Pell Grant in combination with institutional financial aid, provided the overall grant total does not exceed the student-athlete's cost of attendance per 15.01.7.

[15.2.4.2 renumbered as 15.2.4.1, unchanged.]

“15.2.4.1.1 Exception — Pell Grant. In Division I, a Pell Grant shall not be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid of a student-athlete.”

**Source:** University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Florida; University of Georgia; Louisiana State University; University of Mississippi; University of South Carolina, Columbia; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; and Vanderbilt University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Pell Grants are awarded by the Federal government without institutional input to determine the recipients. Students who are not athletes are eligible to receive all of their Pell Grant even if the Pell Grant, in combination with all other merit-based

aid, is more than the cost of attendance because it is an entitlement grant. Student-athletes should be treated in the same manner. This proposal will put institutions on a level playing field by permitting a student-athlete to receive all Pell Grant moneys to which he or she is entitled without any regard to the NCAA cost of attendance restrictions.

**Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism):** The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I, 203-113-8.

#### NO. 34 (NO. 2-76) FINANCIAL AID — SUMMER SCHOOL — DIVISION I

**Intent:** To permit a Division I institution to award athletics aid to a student prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment, without increasing costs.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.7.1.2, page 190, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A and all other Division I members, roll call]

“15.2.7.1.2 Summer Financial Aid — Prior to Initial, Full-Time Collegiate Enrollment. The following conditions apply to the awarding of financial aid to a student-athlete to attend an institution in the summer prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment:

[15.2.7.1.2-(a) through 15.2.7.1.2-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) In Division I only, athletically related financial aid may be awarded for the summer term prior to full-time enrollment. In Divisions II and III, the awarding institution certifies shall certify in writing that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability. The written certification shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics and shall be signed by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid.

“(e) In Division I, the recipient shall be enrolled in not less than five credit hours;

“(f) In Division I, the recipient shall receive athletically related financial aid only in proportion to the amount of athletically related financial aid that the student will receive during the ensuing academic year and shall become a counter during the ensuing academic year per Bylaw 15.5; and

“(g) In Division I, the recipient shall be limited to not more than four additional summer terms of athletics aid.”

**Source:** NCAA Council; University of Florida; University of Houston; Louisiana State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; Northeast Louisiana University; University of Okla-



homa; Oklahoma State University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; and West Virginia University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This permissive legislation provides institutions the flexibility to provide athletically related financial aid to a student-athlete during the summer prior to the student's initial full-time collegiate enrollment, yet includes a provision that restricts summer aid to no more than four additional summer terms and, therefore, will not increase costs. The proposal also will help student-athletes succeed in the classroom. Often, freshman academic casualties are a result of the pressures of adjusting to the collegiate atmosphere. This proposal will assist freshmen in satisfying continuing-eligibility requirements and also will provide a valuable indoctrination for these students. The proposal has the support of the Division I Steering Committee.

**Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism):** The committee took no position on this proposal; however, the committee did suggest that the sponsors clarify the rationale statement.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I-A upon reconsideration, 43-68-7. Not moved by other Division I members.

#### NO. 35 (NO. 2-79) MAXIMUM AWARDS — DIVISION I MEN'S BASKETBALL

**Intent:** To reinstate the grant-in-aid limitation of 14 counters in Division I men's basketball.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.4.1, page 201, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"15.5.4.1 Men's Basketball — Division I. There shall be an annual limit of 13 14 on the total number of counters in the sport of men's basketball at each Division I institution."

**Source:** All members of the Big Ten Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal will provide Division I programs more flexibility to deal with situations when teams are depleted by injury, illness or transfer. The reinstatement of a 14th scholarship also will increase overall opportunities for student-athletes to participate.

**Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism):** The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I, 97-216.

#### NO. 36 (NO. 2-9) RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH — DIVISION I

**Intent:** To create a part-time coaching position in all Division I sports other than Division I-AA football; to convert positions in those sports currently allocated to restricted-earnings coaches to part-time coaches, and to permit part-time coaches to contact and evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus in sports other than football and basketball.

[Note: The language in this proposal differs from the language contained in the 1995-96 NCAA Manual in order to reflect the May 25, 1995, action by the NCAA Administrative Committee to delete the earnings restrictions specified in 11.02.3 and 11.3.4.]

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 11.02.3, pages 51-52, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.02.3 Restricted-Earnings Coach. A restricted-earnings coach is any coach who is designated by the institution's athletics department as a restricted-earnings coach to perform coaching duties and who serves in that capacity on a volunteer or paid basis.

"11.02.3.1 Basketball Limitations. An individual who has not been employed previously as a head or assistant basketball coach in Division I may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in that sport. However, a restricted-earnings coach may temporarily replace a head or assistant basketball coach due to extenuating circumstances and then return to the position of restricted-earnings coach, provided such replacement is approved by the Council per 11.7.1.1.2.4. The individual shall complete his or her period of employment as a restricted-earnings coach within five calendar years of the date of initial employment in such a position and shall not subsequently be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in Division I basketball.

"11.02.3.1.1 Previous Employment. An individual who was employed at one institution as a restricted-earnings basketball coach during the 1993-94 academic year and who previously was employed as a head or assistant basketball coach in Division I may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in the sport of basketball at another Division I institution, regardless of the individual's previous employment. The five-year period of time during which such an individual may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach shall be counted beginning with the 1993-94 academic year."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 11.02 by adding new 11.02.3, page 51, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.02.3 Coach, Part-Time Assistant — Division I. A part-time assistant coach is any coach who receives compensation or remuneration from the institution's athletics department or any organization funded in whole or in part by the athletics department or that is involved primarily in the promotion of the institution's athletics program (e.g., booster club, athletics foundation/association) that is not in excess of the value of a full grant-in-aid at that institution, based upon nonresident tuition and fees regardless of the actual residence status of the coach. (See 15.02.5 for the definition of 'full grant-in-aid.') See 11.3.4 for additional restrictions on compensation, bene-



fits and expenses to part-time coaches.”

- C. Bylaws: Amend 11.3 by adding new 11.3.4, page 57, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**“11.3.4 Compensation, Benefits and Expenses to Part-Time Coaches.** See 11.02.3 for the definition of a part-time coach.

**“11.3.4.1 Compensation for Performing Other Institutional Duties.** A part-time coach may receive compensation for performing duties for another department or office of the institution, provided:

- “(a)** The compensation received for those duties outside the athletics department is commensurate with that received by others performing those same or similar assignments;
- “(b)** The ratio of compensation received for coaching duties and any other duties is directly proportionate to the amount of time devoted to the two areas of assignment; and
- “(c)** The individual is qualified for and is performing the duties outside the athletics department for which the individual is compensated.

**“11.3.4.2 Reduction in Teaching Load to Recognize Coaching Involvement.** A reduction in teaching load or other responsibilities outside the athletics department in recognition of the performance of coaching duties for the athletics department but without a reduction in the individual’s compensation from that outside department counts as compensation from the athletics department. Accordingly, if the compensation representing the reduction, coupled with any financial assistance provided by the athletics department, exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, the individual is considered to be a head or assistant coach and countable in that category.

**“11.3.4.3 Replacement of Part-Time Coaches.** The value of a full grant-in-aid shall be charged against an academic year. Once the value of a full grant-in-aid is paid to a part-time coach for that academic year, additional funds may not be spent on a replacement until the start of the next academic year, even though the first part-time coach is subsequently disassociated from the institution’s athletics program.

**“11.3.4.4 Benefits.** It is not permissible for a part-time coach to receive ‘common coaching benefits’ (e.g., country club memberships, automobiles, postseason bowl-game bonuses) without counting such benefits as compensation from the athletics department. Such

‘benefits’ shall be counted as compensation from the athletics department and computed in determining whether that amount, in addition to any other compensation received, exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid. However, part-time coaches may accept employee benefits available to all institutional employees (which cannot be restricted only to athletics department staff members) (e.g., life insurance, health insurance, disability insurance, tuition waiver) and complimentary tickets to home and away institutional sporting events outside of the coach’s sport based on the institution’s policy for other athletics department employees without the value of those benefits being computed.

**“11.3.4.4.1 Complimentary Tickets.** A part-time coach may accept four complimentary tickets to home and away contests in the coach’s sport.

**“11.3.4.4.2 Training-Table Meals.** A part-time coach may not receive the benefit of training-table meals in addition to the amount of a full grant-in-aid, unless the meals are in conjunction with athletics contests.

**“11.3.4.5 Use of Automobile.** It is not permissible for a part-time coach to utilize an automobile provided by an outside agency for use by all coaches at a free or reduced rate without exceeding the value of a full grant-in-aid amount, unless:

- “(a)** The institution reduces the coach’s financial aid by the amount of the lease rate charged to regular customers by the outside agency or comparable leasing or rental agency, or
- “(b)** The part-time coach pays the outside agency at the regular lease or rental rate.

**“11.3.4.6 Expenses Incurred in the Performance of Coaching Duties.** A part-time coach may receive the following actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of coaching duties:

- “(a)** Expenses incurred on road trips by the team that he or she coaches;
- “(b)** Expenses incurred on trips taken to scout opponents pursuant to 11.6.1;
- “(c)** Expenses to attend the conventions of the national coaches association; or
- “(d)** Expenses for the coach’s spouse and children to attend the institution’s postseason competition.”

- D. Bylaws: Amend 11.7.1.1, page 60, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**“11.7.1.1 Designation of Coaching Category.** An individual who



coaches and either is uncompensated or receives compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution, even if such compensation or remuneration is not designated for coaching, shall be designated as a head coach, assistant coach, *restricted-earnings part-time* coach, volunteer coach, graduate assistant coach or undergraduate assistant coach by certification of the institution."

[Remainder of 11.7.1.1 unchanged.]

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 11.7.4, pages 63-65, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.7.4 Division I Sports Other Than Football — Limitations on Number. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches that may be employed by an institution in each sport (other than football) as follows:

	<i>Restricted-Earnings Coach</i>	<b>Part-Time Coach</b>
"Sport		
"Baseball .....	1	1
"Basketball, Men .....	1	1
"Basketball, Women .....	1	1
"Fencing, Men .....	1	1
"Fencing, Women .....	1	1
"Field Hockey .....	1	1
"Golf, Men .....	1	1
"Golf, Women .....	1	1
"Gymnastics, Men .....	1	1
"Gymnastics, Women .....	1	1
"Ice Hockey .....	1	1
"Lacrosse, Men .....	1	1
"Lacrosse, Women .....	1	1
"Rifle, Men .....	1	1
"Rifle, Women .....	1	1
"Skiing, Men .....	1	1
"Skiing, Women .....	1	1
"Soccer, Men .....	1	1
"Soccer, Women .....	1	1
"Softball, Women .....	1	1
"Swimming, Men .....	1	1
"Swimming and Diving, Men* .....	1*	1*
"Swimming, Women .....	1	1
"Swimming and Diving, Women* .....	1*	1*
"Tennis, Men .....	1	1
"Tennis, Women .....	1	1
"Cross Country, Men (Without Track) .....	1	1
"Track and Field, Men .....	1	1
"Cross Country/Track and Field, Men .....	1	1
"Cross Country, Women (Without Track) .....	1	1
"Track and Field, Women .....	1	1
"Cross Country/Track and Field, Women .....	1	1

"Volleyball, Men .....	1
"Volleyball, Women .....	1
"Water Polo, Men .....	1
"Wrestling .....	1

"\*An institution that conducts men's and women's swimming and diving programs may employ either one *restricted-earnings part-time* coach each for both men's and women's swimming and diving or, in lieu of two *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches, one head or assistant coach (with no limitations on earnings per 11.02.2) to coach both men and women divers.

[11.7.4.1 through 11.7.4.2.3.1 unchanged.]

"11.7.4.2.4 Assistant/*Restricted-Earnings Part-Time* Coaches. In sports other than football and basketball, a coach designated as a head or assistant coach in one sport may be designated as a *restricted-earnings part-time* coach in a second sport without being subject to the limitations specified in 11.02.3 **11.02.4.**

[11.7.4.2.5 unchanged.]

"11.7.4.2.6 Additional *Restricted-Earnings Part-Time* Coaches — National Service Academies. National service academies may employ two additional *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches in the sport of basketball, who shall be prohibited from recruiting off campus."

"11.7.4.3 Off-Campus Contact and Evaluation of Prospects. In the sports of football and basketball, off-campus contact and evaluation of prospects is limited to the head or assistant coach. In sports other than football and basketball, it is permissible for the *restricted-earnings part-time* coach to contact or evaluate prospects off campus."

**Source:** All members of the Ivy Group.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Pending resolution of the lawsuit involving limits on restricted-earnings coaches, this legislation would convert all such positions and compensation limits into the previous part-time category. This legislation is intended to cause the least change possible in the current coaching limits while being consistent with rulings in the lawsuit.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Personnel Limitations):** The subcommittee recommended to the Council that it ask the sponsors to withdraw this proposal. The subcommittee further recommended that if the proposal is not withdrawn, that the Council oppose the proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

**NO. 37 (NO. 2-10) RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH — DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL**

**Intent:** To create part-time coaching positions in Division I-AA foot-



ball and convert positions currently allocated to restricted-earnings coaches to part-time coaches.

*[Note: The language in this proposal differs from the language contained in the 1995-96 NCAA Manual in order to reflect the May 25, 1995, action by the NCAA Administrative Committee to delete the earnings restrictions specified in 11.02.3, 11.3.4 and 11.7.3.]*

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 11.02.3, pages 51-52, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

*"11.02.3 Restricted-Earnings Coach. A restricted-earnings coach is any coach who is designated by the institution's athletics department as a restricted-earnings coach to perform coaching duties and who serves in that capacity on a volunteer or paid basis.*

*"11.02.3.1 Basketball Limitations. An individual who has not been employed previously as a head or assistant basketball coach in Division I may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in that sport. However, a restricted-earnings coach may temporarily replace a head or assistant basketball coach due to extenuating circumstances and then return to the position of restricted-earnings coach, provided such replacement is approved by the Council per 11.7.1.1.2.4. The individual shall complete his or her period of employment as a restricted-earnings coach within five calendar years of the date of initial employment in such a position and shall not subsequently be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in Division I basketball.*

*"11.02.3.1.1 Previous Employment. An individual who was employed at one institution as a restricted-earnings basketball coach during the 1993-94 academic year and who previously was employed as a head or assistant basketball coach in Division I may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in the sport of basketball at another Division I institution, regardless of the individual's previous employment. The five-year period of time during which such an individual may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach shall be counted beginning with the 1993-94 academic year."*

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 11.02 by adding new 11.02.3, page 51 as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

**"11.02.3 Coach, Part-Time Assistant — Division I-AA Football.** A part-time assistant coach is any coach who receives compensation or remuneration from the institution's athletics department or any organization funded in whole or in part by the athletics department or that is involved primarily in the promotion of the institution's athletics program (e.g., booster club, athletics foundation/association) that is not in excess of the value of a full grant-in-aid at that institution, based on nonresident tuition and fees regardless of the actual residence status of the coach. (See 15.02.5 for the definition of 'full grant-in-aid.') See 11.3.4 for additional restrictions on compensation, benefits and expenses to part-time coaches."

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 11.3 by adding new 11.3.4, page 57, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

**"11.3.4 Compensation, Benefits and Expenses to Part-Time Coaches.** See 11.02.3 for the definition of a part-time coach.

**"11.3.4.1 Compensation for Performing Other Institutional Duties.** A part-time coach may receive compensation for performing duties for another department or office of the institution, provided:

- "(a)** The compensation received for those duties outside the athletics department is commensurate with that received by others performing those same or similar assignments;
- "(b)** The ratio of compensation received for coaching duties and any other duties is directly proportionate to the amount of time devoted to the two areas of assignment; and
- "(c)** The individual is qualified for and is performing the duties outside the athletics department for which the individual is compensated.

**"11.3.4.2 Reduction in Teaching Load to Recognize Coaching Involvement.** A reduction in teaching load or other responsibilities outside the athletics department in recognition of the performance of coaching duties for the athletics department but without a reduction in the individual's compensation from that outside department counts as compensation from the athletics department. Accordingly, if the compensation representing the reduction, coupled with any financial assistance provided by the athletics department, exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid, the individual is considered to be a head or assistant coach and countable in that category.

**"11.3.4.3 Summer Compensation.** A part-time coach who receives compensation equivalent to the value of a full grant-in-aid (based on the cost of out-of-state tuition and fees for nonresident students) during the academic year may not receive additional compensation during the summer from the athletics department for summer school or for work performed for the athletics department (e.g., summer camp operated by athletics department).

**"11.3.4.4 Replacement of Part-Time Coaches.** The value of a full grant-in-aid shall be charged against an academic year. Once the value of a full grant-in-aid is paid to a part-time coach for that academic year, additional funds may not be spent on a replacement until the start of the next academic year, even though the first part-time coach is subsequently disassociated from the institution's athletics program.



**"11.3.4.5 Benefits.** It is not permissible for a part-time coach to receive 'common coaching benefits' (e.g., country club memberships, automobiles, postseason bowl-game bonuses) without counting such benefits as compensation from the athletics department. Such 'benefits' shall be counted as compensation from the athletics department and computed in determining whether that amount, in addition to any other compensation received, exceeds the value of a full grant-in-aid. However, part-time coaches may accept employee benefits available to all institutional employees (which cannot be restricted only to athletics department staff members) (e.g., life insurance, health insurance, disability insurance, tuition waiver) and complimentary tickets to home and away institutional sporting events outside of the coach's sport based on the institution's policy for other athletics department employees without the value of those benefits being computed.

**"11.3.4.5.1 Complimentary Tickets.** A part-time coach may accept four complimentary tickets to home and away contests in the coach's sport.

**"11.3.4.5.2 Training-Table Meals.** A part-time coach may not receive the benefit of training-table meals in addition to the value of a full grant-in-aid, unless the meals are in conjunction with athletics contests.

**"11.3.4.6 Use of Automobile.** It is not permissible for a part-time coach to use an automobile provided by an outside agency for use by all coaches at a free or reduced rate without exceeding the value of a full grant-in-aid amount, unless:

**"(a)** The institution reduces the coach's financial aid by the amount of the lease rate charged to regular customers by the outside agency or comparable leasing or rental agency, or

**"(b)** The part-time coach pays the outside agency at the regular lease or rental rate.

**"11.3.4.7 Expenses Incurred in the Performance of Coaching Duties.** A part-time coach may receive the following actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of coaching duties:"

**"(a)** Expenses incurred on road trips by the team that he or she coaches;

**"(b)** Expenses incurred on trips taken to scout opponents pursuant to 11.6.1;

**"(c)** Expenses to attend the conventions of the national coaches association; or

**"(d)** Expenses for the coach's spouse and children to

**attend the institution's postseason competition."**

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 11.7.1.1, page 60, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

**"11.7.1.1 Designation of Coaching Category.** An individual who coaches and either is uncompensated or receives compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution, even if such compensation or remuneration is not designated for coaching, shall be designated as a head coach, assistant coach, *restricted-earnings part-time* coach, volunteer coach, graduate assistant coach or undergraduate assistant coach by certification of the institution."

[Remainder of 11.7.1.1 unchanged.]

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 11.7.3, pages 62-63, as follows:

[Division I-AA football only, roll call]

**"11.7.3 Division I-AA Football.** There shall be a limit of seven head or assistant coaches and four *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches that may be employed by the institution in the sport of Division I-AA football.

[11.7.3.1, 11.7.3.1.1 and 11.7.3.1.2 unchanged.]

**"11.7.3.1.3 Varsity/Freshman Team Football Program.** A Division I-AA member institution that conducts a football program that includes a varsity team and a freshman team may employ two additional *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches. Freshman eligibility for varsity team participation must be prohibited by the institution and the freshman team must participate in five or more intercollegiate contests in order for the two additional *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches to be employed. Such additional *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice seasons in the sport of football.

**"11.7.3.1.4 Varsity/Junior Varsity/Freshman Team Football Program.** A Division I-AA member institution that conducts a football program that includes a varsity team, a junior varsity team and a freshman team may employ four additional *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches. Freshman eligibility for varsity or junior varsity team participation must be prohibited by the institution, the junior varsity team must participate in at least four intercollegiate contests and the freshman team must participate in at least five intercollegiate contests in order for the four additional *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches to be employed. Such additional *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice seasons in the sport of football.

**"11.7.3.1.5 Varsity/Junior Varsity Football Program.** A Division I-AA member institution that conducts a foot-



ball program that includes a varsity team and a junior varsity team may employ two additional *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches. The institution's junior varsity team must participate in at least four intercollegiate contests in order for the two additional *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches to be employed. Such additional *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches may perform football-related duties only during the permissible playing and practice seasons in the sport of football.

"11.7.3.2 Off-Campus Contact and Evaluation of Prospects. Off-campus contact and evaluation of prospects is limited to a total of nine coaches, which may include the head coach and any of the assistant coaches or *restricted-earnings part-time* coaches. In addition, there is a limit of seven coaches (including the head coach) who may contact and evaluate prospects off campus during any one calendar week (defined as Sunday through Saturday). A list of permissible off-campus recruiters shall be designated prior to October 1.

[11.7.3.3 unchanged.]

"11.7.3.3.1 *Restricted-Earnings Part-Time* Coach Exception. *Restricted-earnings Part-time* coaches in Division I-AA may make telephone calls to and prepare general correspondence for prospective student-athletes."

**Source:** All members of the Ivy Group and Southern Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** As the legality of limiting compensation to restricted-earnings coaches has come into question recently, and in the wake of the NCAA Administrative Committee's decision to rescind legislation pertaining to these limits, it is foreseeable that entry level coaching positions in Division I-AA football could cease to exist. This is of significant concern, as these positions are essential in preparing inexperienced coaches to become head or assistant coaches. Replacing the restricted-earnings coach in Division I-AA football with the part-time coach will allow Division I-AA football programs to maintain entry level positions without requiring these coaches to enroll in classes.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Personnel Limitations):** The subcommittee recommended to the Council that it ask the sponsors to withdraw this proposal. The subcommittee further recommended that if the proposal is not withdrawn, that the Council oppose the proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I-AA.

#### NO. 38 NO. (2-11) RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH — DIVISION I

**Intent:** To create graduate assistant coaching positions in all Division I sports other than Division I-AA football; to convert posi-

A-112 \_\_\_\_\_ 1996 Convention Proceedings

tions in those sports currently allocated to restricted-earnings coaches to graduate-assistant coaches, and to permit such graduate assistant coaches to contact and evaluate prospective student-athletes off campus in sports other than football and basketball.

[Note: The language in this proposal differs from the language contained in the 1995-96 NCAA Manual in order to reflect the May 25, 1995, action by the NCAA Administrative Committee to delete the earnings restrictions specified in 11.02.3 and 11.3.4.]

A. **Bylaws:** Amend 11.02.3, pages 51-52, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.02.3 *Restricted-Earnings Coach*. A restricted-earnings coach is any coach who is designated by the institution's athletics department as a restricted-earnings coach to perform coaching duties and who serves in that capacity on a volunteer or paid basis.

"11.02.3.1 *Additional Limitations — Basketball*. An individual who has not been employed previously as a head or assistant basketball coach in Division I may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in that sport. However, a restricted-earnings coach may temporarily replace a head or assistant basketball coach due to extenuating circumstances and then return to the position of restricted-earnings coach, provided such replacement is approved by the Council per 11.7.1.1.2.4. The individual shall complete his or her period of employment as a restricted-earnings coach within five calendar years of the date of initial employment in such a position and shall not subsequently be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in Division I basketball.

"11.02.3.1.1 *Previous Employment*. An individual who was employed at one institution as a restricted-earnings basketball coach during the 1993-94 academic year and who previously was employed as a head or assistant basketball coach in Division I may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach in the sport of basketball at another Division I institution, regardless of the individual's previous employment. The five-year period of time during which such an individual may be employed as a restricted-earnings coach shall be counted beginning with the 1993-94 academic year."

B. **Bylaws:** Amend 11.02.4, page 53, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.02.4 *Coach, Graduate Assistant*. A graduate assistant coach is any coach who has received a baccalaureate degree and is a graduate student enrolled in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies and qualifies for appointment as a graduate assistant under the policies of the institution. The individual is not required to be enrolled in a specific graduate degree program unless required by institutional policy. The following provisions shall apply:

[11.02.4-(a) through 11.02.4-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) **In the sport of football**, the institution may provide actual and necessary expenses for the individual's spouse and children to attend a certified postseason football game or an

Legislative Proposals \_\_\_\_\_ A-113



NCAA championship in the sport of football; and

(g) **In the sports of football and basketball**, the individual may not evaluate or contact prospective student-athletes off campus, regardless of whether compensation is received for such activities.

"11.02.4.1 Replacement of Graduate Assistant Coach — Division I. The compensation or remuneration set forth in 11.02.4 shall be charged against an academic year. In Division I-A, once the amount set forth in 11.02.4(a) is paid to a graduate assistant coach for that academic year, additional funds may not be spent on a replacement until the start of the next academic year, even though the graduate assistant coach subsequently leaves the institution's athletics program during the academic year."

C. **Bylaws:** Amend 11.7.1.1, page 60, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.7.1.1 Designation of Coaching Category. An individual who coaches and either is uncompensated or receives compensation or remuneration of any sort from the institution, even if such compensation or remuneration is not designated for coaching, shall be designated as a head coach, assistant coach, *restricted-earnings coach*, volunteer coach, graduate assistant coach or undergraduate assistant coach by certification of the institution."

[Remainder of 11.7.1.1 unchanged.]

D. **Bylaws:** Amend 11.7.4, pages 63-65, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

"11.7.4 Division I Sports Other Than Football — Limitations on Number. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches that may be employed by an institution in each sport (other than football) as follows:

	<i>Restricted-Earnings Coach</i>	<b>Graduate Assistant Coach</b>
"Sport		
"Baseball .....	1	1
"Basketball, Men .....	1	1
"Basketball, Women .....	1	1
"Fencing, Men .....	1	1
"Fencing, Women .....	1	1
"Field Hockey .....	1	1
"Golf, Men .....	1	1
"Golf, Women .....	1	1
"Gymnastics, Men .....	1	1
"Gymnastics, Women .....	1	1
"Ice Hockey .....	1	1
"Lacrosse, Men .....	1	1
"Lacrosse, Women .....	1	1
"Rifle, Men .....	1	1

"Rifle, Women .....	1
"Skiing, Men .....	1
"Skiing, Women .....	1
"Soccer, Men .....	1
"Soccer, Women .....	1
"Softball, Women .....	1
"Swimming, Men .....	1
"Swimming and Diving, Men* .....	1*
"Swimming, Women .....	1
"Swimming and Diving, Women* .....	1*
"Tennis, Men .....	1
"Tennis, Women .....	1
"Cross Country, Men (Without Track) .....	1
"Track and Field, Men .....	1
"Cross Country/Track and Field, Men .....	1
"Cross Country, Women (Without Track) .....	1
"Track and Field, Women .....	1
"Cross Country/Track and Field, Women .....	1
"Volleyball, Men .....	1
"Volleyball, Women .....	1
"Water Polo, Men .....	1
"Wrestling .....	1

"\* An institution that conducts men's and women's swimming and diving programs may employ either one *restricted-earnings graduate assistant* coach each for both men's and women's swimming and diving or, in lieu of two *restricted-earnings graduate assistant* coaches, one head or assistant coach (with no limitations on earnings per 11.02.2) to coach both men and women divers.

[11.7.4.1 through 11.7.4.2.3.1 unchanged.]

"11.7.4.2.4 Assistant/*Restricted-Earnings Graduate Assistant* Coaches. In sports other than football and basketball, a coach designated as a head or assistant coach in one sport may be designated as a *restricted-earnings graduate assistant* coach in a second sport without being subject to the limitations specified in 11.02.3 11.02.4.

[11.7.4.2.5 unchanged.]

"11.7.4.2.6 Additional *Restricted-Earnings Graduate Assistant* Coaches — National Service Academies. National service academies may employ two additional *restricted-earnings graduate assistant* coaches in the sport of basketball, who shall be prohibited from recruiting off campus."

"11.7.4.3 Off-Campus Contact and Evaluation of Prospects. In the sports of football and basketball, off-campus contact and evaluation of prospects is limited to the head or assistant coach. In sports other than football and basketball, it is permissible for the *restricted-earnings graduate assistant* coach to contact or evaluate prospects off campus."

**Source:** All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Louisiana State University;



ty; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Oklahoma; Oklahoma State University; Purdue University; University of South Carolina, Columbia; Texas Tech University; University of Tulsa; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; and West Virginia University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Recognizing the U.S. Federal District Court ruling that the NCAA was liable under Federal antitrust laws, the NCAA Administrative Committee rescinded the NCAA rules limiting compensation to restricted-earnings coaches. As a result, salaries for coaches in this category could increase dramatically, exacerbating the strain on existing budgets. Replacing the restricted-earnings position with graduate assistant coaches will permit institutions to maintain the current number of coaches in affected sports, while at the same time alleviate potential problems related to salaries and benefits. Existing compensation rules for graduate assistant coaches would continue to apply, per 11.02.4. Additionally, the proposal would permit graduate assistant coaches to evaluate and contact prospective student-athletes off-campus in sports other than football and basketball.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Personnel Limitations):** The subcommittee recommended to the Council that it ask the sponsors to withdraw this proposal. The subcommittee further recommended that if the proposal is not withdrawn, that the Council oppose the proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 38-1 RESTRICTED-EARNINGS COACH — DIVISION I

**Intent:** To permit the national service academies to employ part-time coaches in lieu of graduate assistant coaches.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 38-D, 11.7.4, by adding new 11.7.4.4, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"11.7.4.4 National Service Academies. The national service academies may employ part-time coaches in lieu of graduate assistant coaches and other additional coaches authorized by exceptions in Bylaws 11.7.2.1.4 and 11.7.4.2.6."**

**Source:** Louisiana State University, University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, Texas Christian University, Texas Tech University, U.S. Military Academy, U.S. Naval Academy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, and West Virginia University.

**Rationale:** The national service academies do not have graduate students and cannot retain the services of graduate assistant coaches. This legislation would allow the service academies to

retain the services of part-time coaches instead of graduate assistant coaches, as proposed in the original legislation.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### NO. 39 (NO. 2-14) COACHING LIMITATIONS — DIVISION I ICE HOCKEY

**Intent:** To establish a coaching limitation in Division I ice hockey of three head or assistant coaches instead of two head or assistant coaches and one restricted-earnings coach.

**Bylaws:** Amend 11.7.4, pages 63-65, as follows:

[Division I only, roll call]

**"11.7.4 Division I Sports Other Than Football — Limitations on Number. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches that may be employed by an institution in each sport (other than football) as follows:**

<b>"Sport</b>	<b>Head or Assistant Coach</b>	<b>Restricted- Earnings Coach</b>
<b>"Ice Hockey</b>	<b>2 3</b>	<b>1 0"</b>

[Remainder of 11.7.4 unchanged.]

**Source:** University of Alaska Anchorage; Colorado College; Lake Superior State University; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University; and University of Wisconsin, Madison.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Three full-time coaches are justified in ice hockey because it is a fast-paced, contact sport with an average squad size of 30 student-athletes. Recruiting is international, with much of it done in Canada, meaning not all coaches can attend all practice sessions due to recruiting demands. Thus, it is important for safety, coaching, counseling and academic reasons to have three full-time coaches in this sport.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Personnel Limitations):** The subcommittee recommended to the Council that it ask the sponsors to withdraw this proposal. The subcommittee further recommended that if the proposal is not withdrawn, that the Council oppose the proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 40 (NO. 2-90) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — FIRST ON-COURT BASKETBALL PRACTICE — DIVISION III

**Intent:** In Division III basketball, to permit institutions to commence on-court preseason basketball practice on the fourth Sat-



urday preceding the first permissible contest date.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.2.1, page 246, as follows:

[Division III only, roll call]

"17.3.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to October 15 in Divisions I and II and the fourth *Monday Saturday* preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.3.3-(a) and 17.3.3-(b) in Division III."

[Remainder of 17.3.2.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** Brandeis University, Carnegie Mellon University, Case Western Reserve University, Emory University, Johns Hopkins University, New York University, University of Rochester and Washington University (Missouri).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Current rules permit on-court basketball practice to begin on the fourth Monday preceding the first permissible contest date. This proposal will allow on-court practice to begin on the Saturday of that same weekend, two days earlier than the current legislation allows. For most, if not all, institutions, the first few days of on-court practice include a tryout period during which interested students are given the opportunity to perform, to be evaluated and to be selected to participate as team members. Beginning on-court practice on Saturday rather than Monday allows the most stressful period of this process to begin on days when classes are not in session on most campuses. This provides a somewhat more relaxed atmosphere for the potential student-athletes, does not introduce conflicts with scheduled classes and provides coaches more flexibility in handling the larger numbers of players involved during the initial tryout and practice periods.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Division III, paddle vote.

**NO. 41 (NO. 2-96) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS  
— PRESEASON SCRIMMAGE —  
DIVISION III FOOTBALL**

**Intent:** To permit a Division III institution to exempt participation in one preseason football scrimmage against outside competition from its maximum number of football contests, provided the scrimmage is conducted in privacy, without publicity or official scoring, and takes place on a day on which neither team misses class.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.7.5.2, pages 268-269, as follows:

[Division III football only, roll call]

"17.7.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football

contests shall exclude the following:

[17.7.5.2-(a) through 17.7.5.2-(g) unchanged.]

**"(h) Division III Preseason Scrimmage. One informal preseason practice scrimmage against outside competition (conducted in privacy without publicity or official scoring and provided neither team misses class)."**

[17.7.5.2-(h) through 17.7.5.2-(p) relettered as 17.7.5.2-(i) through 17.7.5.2-(q), unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Middle Atlantic States Collegiate Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Two years ago, the Division III membership approved expanded scrimmage opportunities for the following fall sports: cross country, field hockey, soccer and women's volleyball. A similar opportunity should be made available to football student-athletes. The scrimmage would provide a practice opportunity where the coaches are able to experiment with their personnel and players are able to prove their worth. The scrimmage would provide a healthy "tune-up" for the physical well-being of the student-athlete participating in this contact sport at minimal cost. The scrimmage would take place on a day that would not interfere with class time. The scrimmage would not alter the first permissible date for practice. The scrimmage would not be mandatory, but would provide an opportunity for those wishing to take advantage of its merits.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee supports this proposal with the understanding that such a scrimmage would not alter the first permissible date for preseason practice.

**Action:** Adopted by Division III, paddle vote.

**Amateurism/Awards/Benefits**

**NO. 42 (NO. 2-16) PROFESSIONAL ATHLETICS  
TEAM/LEAGUE**

[Note: The sponsors indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

**Intent:** To revise the definition of a professional athletics team as specified; to provide a definition of a professional athletics league; to create an exception to the definition of a professional team or league related to an individual's participation in national team competition, and to delete the "knew or had reason to know" language from the applicable amateurism provisions.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 12.02.5, page 69, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]



"12.02.5 Professional Athletics Team. A professional athletics team is any organized team that:

"(a) Is a member of a recognized professional sports organization;

"(b) Is directly supported or sponsored by a professional team or professional sports organization;

"(c) Is a member of a playing league that is directly supported or sponsored by a professional team or professional sports organization, or

"(d) Has an athlete receiving for his or her participation any kind of payment, directly or indirectly, from a professional team or professional sports organization.

"(a) Provides any of its players more than actual and necessary expenses for participation on the team, except as otherwise permitted by NCAA legislation. Actual and necessary expenses are limited to the following, provided the value of these items is commensurate with their fair market value in the locality of the player(s) and is not excessive in nature:

"(1) Meals;

"(2) Lodging;

"(3) Apparel, equipment and supplies;

"(4) Coaching and instruction;

"(5) Health/medical insurance;

"(6) Transportation (i.e., expenses to and from practice and competition, cost of transportation from home to training/practice site at the beginning of the season and from training/practice site to home at the end of the season);

"(7) Medical treatment and physical therapy;

"(8) Facility usage; and

"(9) Entry fees; or

"(b) Declares itself to be nonamateur, semiprofessional or professional; or

"(c) Is a member of a professional athletics league or organization; or

"(d) Is directly supported or sponsored by a professional athletics league or organization."

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.02 by adding new 12.02.6, page 70, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.02.6 Professional Athletics League or Organization. A professional athletics league or organization is any sports league or organization that:

"(a) Provides any of its players more than actual and necessary expenses for participation in the league or organization except as otherwise permitted by NCAA legislation. Actual and necessary expenses are limited to the following, provided the value of these items

is commensurate with their fair market value in the locality of the player(s) and is not excessive in nature:

"(1) Meals;

"(2) Lodging;

"(3) Apparel, equipment and supplies;

"(4) Coaching and instruction;

"(5) Health/medical insurance;

"(6) Transportation (i.e., expenses to and from practice and competition, cost of transportation from home to training/practice site at the beginning of the season and from training/practice site to home at the end of the season);

"(7) Medical treatment and physical therapy;

"(8) Facility usage; and

"(9) Entry fees; or

"(b) Declares itself to be nonamateur, semiprofessional or professional."

C. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1, page 70, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.1.1 Amateur Status. An individual loses amateur status and thus shall not be eligible for intercollegiate competition in a particular sport if the individual:

[12.1.1-(a) through 12.1.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Competes on any professional athletics team and knows (or had reason to know) that the team is a professional athletics team (per 12.02.5), even if no pay or remuneration for expenses was received;" or

[Remainder of 12.1.1 unchanged.]

D. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.3, page 72, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.1.3 Professionalism. An individual is not eligible for participation in an intercollegiate sport if that individual ever has been a professional in that sport. An individual becomes a professional if he or she:

[12.1.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Participates on a team and knows (or had reason to know) that the team is a professional athletics team (per 12.02.5) in that sport or"

[Remainder of 12.1.3 unchanged.]

E. Bylaws: Amend 12.2.3.2, page 73, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.2.3.2 Competition With Professionals. An individual shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics in a sport if the individual ever participated on a team and knew (or had reason to know) that the team was a professional team (per 12.02.5) in that sport. However-



er, an individual may compete on tennis or golf teams with persons who are competing for cash or a comparable prize, provided the individual does not receive payment of any kind for such participation."

[Remainder of 12.2.3.2 unchanged.]

**F. Bylaws:** Amend 12.2.3.2.1, page 73, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.2.3.2.1 *Professional Player as Team Member.* An individual may participate with a professional on a team, provided the professional is not being paid by a professional team or league to play as a member of that team (e.g., summer basketball leagues with teams composed of both professional and amateur athletes)

**Exception for National/International Competition.** An individual who receives only actual and necessary expenses shall not jeopardize his or her amateur status in a sport if he or she participates on a national team (as defined by the national governing body in that sport) with a person who receives more than actual and necessary expenses to play as a member of that team."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** During the last 18 months, the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee worked to develop simpler definitions of a professional athletics team and league, in order to remedy the circular nature of the current definition in Bylaw 12.02.5. The committee has received suggestions from the Eligibility Committee, the Professional Sports Liaison Committee and the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism. The new definitions will assist the membership in making a determination as to whether an individual, particularly an international student-athlete, has participated on a professional team or league and, thus, has jeopardized eligibility in that sport. Participation in competition that is sanctioned by a national or international sports governing body in a particular sport would not be considered participation on a professional athletics team, even if some members of the team receive pay in excess of actual and necessary expenses to play as members of that team. The proposal also eliminates the "knew or had reason to know" language from the applicable amateurism bylaws, inasmuch as this standard is difficult for institutions to apply.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

**NO. 43 (NO. 2-21) DE MINIMUS VIOLATIONS —  
PROSPECTIVE AND ENROLLED  
STUDENT-ATHLETES**

**Intent:** To specify instances in which a de minimus violation will not render a prospective student-athlete or enrolled student-athlete ineligible while retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 12.5.2.1, page 80, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.5.2.1 Advertisements and Promotions Subsequent to Enrollment. Subsequent to becoming a student-athlete, an individual shall not be eligible for participation in intercollegiate athletics if the individual:

[12.5.2.1-(a) and 12.5.2.1-(b) unchanged.]

"12.5.2.1.1 Exceptions. The individual's eligibility will not be affected, provided the individual participated in such activities prior to enrollment and the individual:

"(a) Meets the conditions set forth in 12.5.1.3 that would permit continuation of such activities; or

"(b) Takes appropriate steps upon becoming a student-athlete to retract permission for the use of his or her name or picture and ceases receipt of any remuneration for such an arrangement; or

"(c) Can establish that the institution, without the student-athlete's knowledge or consent, used the student-athlete's name or picture in a manner contrary to the provisions of this bylaw. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 12.5.4, pages 80-81, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.5.4 Use of Logos on Equipment, Uniforms and Apparel. A student-athlete may use athletics equipment or wear athletics apparel that bears the trademark or logo of an athletics equipment or apparel manufacturer or distributor in athletics competition and pre- and postgame activities (e.g., celebrations on the court, pre- or postgame press conferences), provided the following criteria are met. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility."

[Remainder of 12.5.4 unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.3.1, page 91, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.3.1 Time Period For Telephone Calls — General Rule. In Divisions I and II sports other than football, telephone calls to a prospect (or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians) may not be made prior to July 1 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school; thereafter, staff members shall not make such telephone calls more than once per week. If more than one call per week occurs due to a scheduled official paid visit that subsequently is canceled by the prospect, the eligibility of the prospect shall not be affected. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility."



[Remainder of 13.1.3.1 unchanged.]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.7.3, page 94, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.7.3 Contacts Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing Or Other Written Commitment. Subsequent to the calendar day on which a prospect signs a National Letter of Intent, there shall be no limit on the number of contacts by the institution with which the prospect has signed. For an institution not utilizing the National Letter of Intent in a particular sport, there shall be no limit on the number of contacts with the prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) by that institution subsequent to the calendar day of the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. However, the following conditions continue to apply. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**"

[Remainder of 13.1.7.3 unchanged.]

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-99, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I). **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**"

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

**F. Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.2, page 99, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.4.2 Divisions I and II — Video Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not produce video materials to show or send to a prospect except as specified in 13.4.2.1 and 13.4.2.2. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**"

[Remainder of 13.4.2 unchanged.]

**G. Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.1.2.1, page 102, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.7.1.2.1 Written Notification Required. Each Division I or II member institution shall be required to notify the prospect in

writing, at the time of its invitation but prior to the visit, of the five-visit limitation. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**"

**H. Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.1.2.3, pages 102-103, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.7.1.2.3 Academic Requirements for Official Visit

[13.7.1.2.3.1 through 13.7.1.2.3.3 unchanged.]

**"13.7.1.2.3.4 Eligibility Ramifications. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility."**

**I. Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.1.2.4, page 103, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.7.1.2.4 Academic Credentials For Official Visit Prior To Early Signing Period. A Division I member institution may provide an expense-paid visit to a prospect in a sport that has an early signing period for the National Letter of Intent prior to the initial early signing date in that sport only if the prospect has presented the institution with a minimum combined SAT score of 700 or PSAT score of 70 or a minimum composite ACT or PLAN (or PACT Plus) score of 17, and also has presented a minimum 2.000 grade-point average in at least seven core courses (per 14.3.1.1). A prospect in the applicable sports who does not present these academic credentials shall not begin an official visit until 24 hours after the last day of the early signing period in that sport. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**"

[Remainder of 13.7.1.2.4 unchanged.]

**J. Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.2, page 104, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.7.2 Length of Official Visit. An official visit to an institution shall not exceed 48 hours. A prospect may remain in the locale in which the institution is located after the permissible 48-hour period for reasons unrelated to the official visit, provided that at the completion of the 48-hour visit, the individual departs the institution's campus and the institution does not pay any expenses thereafter, including the cost of return transportation to the prospect's home. Further, if the prospect does not return home prior to attending the institution, the one-way transportation to the campus would be considered a violation of 13.6.4, which prohibits transportation to enroll. **Violations of this bylaw due to inclement weather shall be considered institutional violations; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**"

[Remainder of 13.7.2 unchanged.]



**Source:** NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal takes current legislation that affects a prospect's or student-athlete's eligibility and eliminates the ineligibility component from that legislation. The proposal encompasses many instances where an institutional official fails to perform an administrative function or procedure, which renders the prospect or student-athlete ineligible, even though there is little or no recruiting or competitive advantage. An example includes a prospect being declared ineligible when an institution fails to send the prospect the required five-visit limitation letter prior to an official visit. Currently, violations of these provisions always result in immediate restoration of eligibility without conditions. It is important to note, however, that although violations of these provisions would have no eligibility ramifications, the institution still would need to report the violation.

**Action:** Parts A and B adopted. Parts C, D, E, F, G and H adopted by Divisions I and II. Part I adopted by Division I. Part J adopted by Divisions I, II and III.

#### NO. 43-1 DE MINIMUS VIOLATIONS — PROSPECTIVE AND ENROLLED STUDENT-ATHLETES

**Intent:** To specify that the de minimus exception related to an official visit would apply only to the length of the visit and not to the failure of the prospect to return home after the visit.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 43-J, 13.7.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"13.7.2 Length of Official Visit. An official visit to an institution shall not exceed 48 hours. A prospect may remain in the locale in which the institution is located after the permissible 48-hour period for reasons unrelated to the official visit, provided that at the completion of the 48-hour visit, the individual departs the institution's campus and the institution does not pay any expenses thereafter, including the cost of return transportation to the prospect's home. Further, if the prospect does not return home prior to attending the institution, the one-way transportation to the campus would be considered a violation of 13.6.4, which prohibits transportation to enroll. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations; however, **they violations related to the 48-hour limitation on the length of the visit** shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility."

[Remainder of 13.7.2 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

**Rationale:** The failure of a prospect to return home after an official visit could represent a significant recruiting advantage and

should continue to have eligibility consequences.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Divisions I, II and III.

#### NO. 44 (NO. 2-17) AMATEUR STATUS — EXPENSES BASED ON PLACE FINISH

**Intent:** To establish an exception to the Association's amateurism legislation, to be administered by the Association's member institutions, for an individual who receives actual and necessary expenses based on place finish, provided the expenses do not exceed \$1,000 per event and accrue during a period not to exceed one year.

**Bylaws:** Amend 12.1.2 by adding new 12.1.2.9, page 72, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

**"12.1.2.9 Exception — Limited Expenses Based on Place of Finish. An individual may receive actual and necessary expenses based on place finish, provided the expenses do not exceed \$1,000 per event and all expenses accrue during a time period that does not exceed one year."**

**"12.1.2.9.1 Administration and Documentation. The institution must maintain a file in the office of the director of athletics detailing the institution's analysis and application of this exception for each student-athlete to whom the exception is applied."**

**Source:** NCAA Council (Eligibility Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal is designed to permit institutions to handle small, inconsequential amateurism violations through the creation of a limited exception to current legislation. The student-athletes who will meet this exception are those whom the Eligibility Committee currently restores to eligibility without condition.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Divisions I, II and III.

#### NO. 45 (NO. 2-18) AMATEURISM — COMPETITION WITH PROFESSIONALS

**Intent:** To permit an individual to participate on two-person sand volleyball teams with persons who are competing for cash or a comparable prize, provided the individual does not receive payment of any kind for such participation.

**Bylaws:** Amend 12.2.3.2, page 73, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

**"12.2.3.2 Competition With Professionals. An individual shall not be eligible for intercollegiate athletics in a sport if the individual ever participated on a team and knew (or had reason to know) that the team was a professional team (per 12.02.5) in**



that sport. However, an individual may compete on tennis or golf or two-person sand volleyball teams with persons who are competing for cash or a comparable prize, provided the individual does not receive payment of any kind for such participation.”  
[Remainder of 12.2.3.2 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Two-person sand volleyball more closely resembles an individual sport and should be treated the same as the sports of tennis and golf, inasmuch as the players change partners frequently as alliances shift or better partners become available. The procedures established by the International Volleyball Federation to qualify individuals for the Olympic team involve participation in World Beach Series events, which are prize-money events in which professional beach players participate. This proposal will assist individuals in reaching their goal of making the Olympic team without jeopardizing their amateur status in intercollegiate volleyball.

**Action:** Adopted.

#### NO. 46 (NO. 2-20) EXCEPTION FOR WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS PARTICIPATION

**Intent:** To include World Championships and World Cup events sanctioned by the appropriate national or international governing body in those bylaws that currently include exceptions for the Olympic, Pan American and World University Games.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 12.5.1.12, page 79, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

“12.5.1.12 Olympic, Pan American, **World Championships, World Cup** and World University Games. A student-athlete’s name or picture may be used to promote Olympic, Pan American, **World Championships, World Cup** or World University Games as specified in this section.”

[Remainder of 12.5.1.12 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 14.1.6.2.2.1.2, page 135, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“14.1.6.2.2.1.2 Olympic, Pan American, **World Championships, World Cup** or World University Games. The Academic Requirements Committee may waive the minimum full-time enrollment requirement for any participant in the Olympic, Pan American, **World Championships, World Cup** or World University Games who, because of such participation, may lose eligibility for practice and competition in any sport.”

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.1.5, page 137, as follows:

[Division I only]

“14.2.1.5 Athletics Activities Waiver. The Council, or a committee designated by it, shall have the authority to waive this provision by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting to permit student-athletes to participate in:

“(a) Official Pan American, **World Championships, World Cup**, World University and Olympic training, tryouts and competition;”

[Remainder of 14.2.1.5 unchanged.]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 14.4.3.6, page 158, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“14.4.3.6 Waivers of Satisfactory-Progress Rule. The Academic Requirements Committee shall establish appropriate criteria for waivers of this legislation. Such waivers shall be administered by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of an independent institution, by the Eligibility Committee. Waivers of the satisfactory-progress rule may be granted under any of the following conditions:

[14.4.3.6-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) International competition — The credit hours required under the satisfactory-progress regulation of 14.4.3.1-(a) may be prorated at 12 hours per term of actual attendance during an academic year in which the student is not enrolled for a term or terms or is unable to complete a term as a result of participation in the Pan American, Olympic, **World Championships, World Cup** or World University Games (including final Olympic tryouts and the officially recognized training program that directly qualifies participants for those tryouts). This waiver provision may be applied to no more than two semesters or three quarters.”

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 14.7.6.1 by adding new 14.7.6.1-(d), pages 168-169, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“14.7.6.1 For All Sports. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, shall have the authority to waive the provisions of 14.7.1 and 14.7.2 to permit student-athletes to participate in the following, for all sports:

[14.7.6.1-(a) and 14.7.6.1-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) Official tryouts and competition involving national teams sponsored by the appropriate national governing bodies of the U.S. Olympic Committee (or, for the student-athletes representing another nation, the equivalent organization of that nation or, for student-athletes competing in a non-Olympic sport, the equivalent organization in that sport); and

“(d) **Official World Championships and World Cup tryouts and competition; and**”

[14.7.6.1-(d) relettered as 14.7.6.1-(e), unchanged.]



**F. Bylaws:** Amend 16.8.1.3, page 220, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.8.1.3 Other Competition. An institution may provide student-athletes who are eligible to represent the institution in athletics competition with actual and necessary expenses related to participation in the following activities:

[16.8.1.3-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) Olympic, Pan American, **World Championships, World Cup** and World University Games qualifying competition;"

[Remainder of 16.8.1.3 unchanged.]

**G. Bylaws:** Amend 16.10.2.4, page 222, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.10.2.4 Outside Event. An institution may not pay transportation or other expenses for a student-athlete to attend any athletics event when he or she is not representing the institution, except for established national championships (including junior national championships); Olympic, Pan American, **World Championships, World Cup** and World University Games qualifying competition, and USOC Olympic Festival basketball and volleyball tryouts."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** For many sports, the World Championships and the World Cup have become premier events and are considered as important as the Olympic, Pan American and World University Games. Including World Championships and the World Cup in the legislation that currently provides exceptions for the Olympic, Pan American and World University Games will provide student-athletes with additional opportunities to represent their country in important international competition.

**Action:** Parts A, F and G adopted. Parts B and E adopted by Divisions I, II and III. Part C adopted by Division I. Part D adopted by Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 47 (NO. 2-81) AWARDS AND BENEFITS — NCAA CHAMPIONSHIPS AND BOWL GAMES

**Intent:** To permit an institution to provide six complimentary admissions to each student-athlete who participates in or is a member of a team that participates in an NCAA championship or bowl game.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.2.1.1 by adding new 16.2.1.1.1, page 214, renumbering subsequent section as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"**16.2.1.1.1 Exception — NCAA Championships and Bowl Games.** An institution may provide each student-athlete

who participates in or is a member of a team participating in an NCAA championship or bowl game with six complimentary admissions to all contests at the site at which the student (or team) participates."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division I Men's Basketball Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The receipt of two additional complimentary admissions during NCAA championship and bowl game participation is a meaningful change to benefit deserving student-athletes.

**Action:** Adopted.

#### NO. 48 (NO. 2-83) EXPENSES FOR OUTSIDE COMPETITION — SOFTBALL

**Intent:** To permit an institution to provide softball student-athletes who are eligible to represent the institution in athletics competition with actual and necessary expenses to participate in softball tryouts for the U.S. Olympic Committee's Olympic Festival.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.8.1.3, page 220, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.8.1.3 Other Competition. An institution may provide student-athletes who are eligible to represent the institution in athletics competition with actual and necessary expenses related to participation in the following activities:

[16.8.1.3-(a) through 16.8.1.3-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) USOC Olympic Festival basketball, **softball** and volleyball tryouts."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal would permit an institution to provide softball student-athletes who are eligible to represent their institution in athletics competition with actual and necessary expenses to participate in the USOC's Olympic Festival softball tryouts. This same opportunity currently exists for basketball and volleyball student-athletes. Further, the Olympic Festival has grown substantially in importance for the sport of softball during the last few years.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### NO. 49 (NO. 2-84) EXPENSES — TRAVEL TO REGULAR-SEASON CONTESTS DURING VACATION PERIOD — DIVISIONS I AND II

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II, to permit an institution to provide transportation expenses for a student-athlete to travel from campus to the site of a regular-season contest and back to cam-



pus during the vacation period even if the student-athlete does not travel with the team, provided the student-athlete pays the difference in cost associated with traveling to a site other than the event site.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.8.1 by adding new 16.8.1.4, page 220, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

**"16.8.1.4 Travel to Regular-Season Contests During Vacation Period — Divisions I and II.**

**"16.8.1.4.1 General Rule.** An institution may provide team transportation for a student-athlete to travel from campus to the site of a regular-season contest and back to campus.

**"16.8.1.4.1.1 Exception.** If a student-athlete travels to a site other than the event site during the vacation period, the institution may provide the cost of round-trip transportation for the student-athlete to travel from campus to the event site and back to campus even if the student-athlete does not travel with the team. The student-athlete shall pay only the additional cost associated with traveling to a site other than the event site."

**Source:** NCAA Council and all members of the Ivy Group.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Current NCAA interpretations require a student-athlete in some instances to pay the equivalent of a round-trip ticket to his or her home when traveling home during vacation in conjunction with an away-from-home regular-season contest, even if the team itinerary includes a stop in the student-athlete's home city at no additional cost to the institution. The current rule, in effect, can require students to subsidize team travel if the student-athlete remains home following the conclusion of the event. Student-athletes should be responsible only for any additional costs incurred when they travel home in conjunction with an away-from-home contest.

**Committee Position (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee):**  
The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I and II.

**NO. 50 (NO. 2-85) RECOGNITION BY PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ORGANIZATION**

**Intent:** To permit a professional sports organization to recognize a student-athlete or a collegiate team at a professional sports contest for an extraordinary achievement, to permit the professional sports organization to provide complimentary admissions to the student-athletes to attend the contest and to permit the pro-

fessional sports organization to promote the event to the general public.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.11.1, pages 223-224, by adding new 16.11.1.9, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"16.11.1.9 Recognition by Professional Sports Organization.** A student-athlete may accept complimentary admission to a professional sports contest during which the student-athlete and/or collegiate team is being recognized by the professional sports organization for extraordinary achievements. Further, it shall be permissible for the professional sports organization to promote this event to the general public."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Professional Sports Liaison Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Professional sports organizations routinely honor student-athletes and/or teams in various ways to recognize extraordinary achievements. This proposal represents a "common sense" treatment of an issue that can be a wonderful opportunity for student-athletes without compromising the intent of the Association's amateurism standards.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

**Financial Aid**

**NO. 51 (NO. 2-75) FINANCIAL AID — EXEMPTED GOVERNMENT GRANTS**

**Intent:** To include benefits received by student-athletes under the AmeriCorps program among the exempted government grants set forth in Bylaw 15.2.4.2.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.4.2, page 187, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

**"15.2.4.2 Exempted Government Grants.** The following government grants for educational purposes shall not be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid or cost of attendance of a student-athlete:

**"(a) AmeriCorps Program.** Benefits received by student-athletes under the AmeriCorps Program."

[15.2.4.2-(a) through 15.2.4.2-(f) relettered as 15.2.4.2-(b) through 15.2.4.2-(g), unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.



**Rationale:** The AmeriCorps program is a national service program. Benefits received by student-athletes under the AmeriCorps program should be treated like Veteran's benefits, as an exempted government grant.

**Action:** Adopted.

**NO. 52 (NO. 2-78) FINANCIAL AID — EQUIVALENCY  
FIGURE FOR BOOKS**

**Intent:** To increase the financial aid equivalency figure for books from \$200 to \$400.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.3.3, pages 200-201, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"15.5.3.3 Equivalency Computations. In equivalency sports, each institutional financial aid award (per 15.02.4.1) to a counter shall be computed as follows:

"(a) Once a student becomes a counter, the institution shall count all institutional aid (per 15.02.4.1) received for room, board, tuition and fees, as well as books (which shall count for calculation purposes as \$200 **\$400** in the denominator and, if they are provided or their cost covered by the institution, as \$200 **\$400** in the numerator, regardless of the actual amount received). Exempted government grants per 15.2.4 and exempted institutional aid per 15.02.4.3 specifically are excluded from this computation."

[Remainder of 15.5.3.3 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Book costs average approximately \$400 at Divisions I and II institutions. Adjusting the book figure by \$200 does affect the resulting calculation the student-athlete is receiving (increasing the equivalency if aid is covering books and decreasing it if aid for books is not being awarded); however, such an effect across an entire sports team would be inconsequential, except in limited situations involving sports with high equivalency limits (e.g., when most of the student-athletes in the sport receive aid only for books and the institution's full grant-in-aid cost is low).

**Action:** Adopted by Division I and II.

**NO. 53 (NO. 2-69) FULL GRANT-IN-AID — SUPPLIES**

**Intent:** To include a maximum of \$450 of required course-related supplies in a full grant-in-aid.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.01.7, page 182, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"15.01.7 Maximum Institutional Financial Aid to Individual. An institution shall not award financial aid to a student-athlete that exceeds the cost of attendance that normally is incurred by students enrolled in a comparable program at that institution or that exceeds the limitations established by the membership division of the institution the student-athlete attends, whichever is less. Any financial aid permitted by a division that would result in a student-athlete's total financial aid exceeding the value of tuition and fees, room and board, *and* required course-related books **and required course-related supplies not to exceed a maximum of \$450** shall be based upon the demonstrated financial need of the individual student-athlete (see 15.02.4, 15.2.3, 15.4, 15.5.2, 15.5.3, 15.5.4 and 15.5.5)."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.02.5.1, page 183, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A, all other Division I members and Division II, divided vote]

"15.02.5.1 Divisions I and II. A full grant-in-aid is financial aid that consists of tuition and fees, room and board, *and* required course-related books **and required course-related supplies not to exceed a maximum of \$450.**"

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.3.3, pages 200-201, as follows:

[Federated provision, Division I-A, all other Division I members and Division II, divided vote]

"15.5.3.3 Equivalency Computations. In equivalency sports, each institutional financial aid award (per 15.02.4.1) to a counter shall be computed as follows:

"(a) Once a student becomes a counter, the institution shall count all institutional aid (per 15.02.4.1) received for room, board, tuition and fees, as well as books **and supplies** (which shall count for calculation purposes as \$200 in the denominator and, if they are provided or their cost covered by the institution, as \$200 in the numerator, regardless of the actual amount received). Exempted grants per 15.2.4 and exempted institutional aid per 15.02.4.3 specifically are excluded from this computation."

[Remainder of 15.5.3.3 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** In many courses, required supplies are a larger cost item than books. A student-athlete who is on a book grant should be permitted to receive a reasonable amount of supplies as well. A cap of \$450 per academic year has been placed on the amount of supplies that may be provided in the spirit of cost containment. This proposal is designed to keep the equivalency calculation simple; if books and/or supplies are provided, the figure of \$200 is placed in both the numerator and denominator.

**Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism):** The committee agreed to take no position on this pro-



posals; however, the committee did recommend that some issues be clarified. Specifically, the committee thought it may be helpful to the membership to specify in the legislation that the modifying phrase "required course-related" applies to supplies in addition to books. The committee also believed that it should be understood that if the proposal is adopted, institutions would be absorbing costs that currently are picked up by the use of the Special Assistance Fund. Additionally, the committee felt as though a listing of examples of required course-related supplies in the proposal's rationale statement would be helpful. Finally, the committee suggested that the sponsors research the "true" value of required course-related books and supplies and modify the existing \$200 figure accordingly.

**Action:** Part A defeated. Parts B and C moot.

#### NO. 54 (NO. 2-77) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION I WOMEN'S SPORTS

**Intent:** To increase the total number of counters in Division I women's gymnastics; to increase the maximum number of equivalencies in Division I women's field hockey, lacrosse, soccer, softball, and track and field; to decrease the maximum number of equivalencies in Division I women's badminton, squash and team handball, and to establish a limit of six on the maximum number of equivalencies in Division I women's cross country.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.2.1, page 199, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.5.2.1 Maximum Limits. An institution shall be limited in any academic year to the total number of counters (head count) in each of the following sports:

"Division I:

"Women's Gymnastics ..... 10 12"

[Remainder of 15.5.2.1 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.3.1.2, pages 199-200, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.5.3.1.2 Division I Women's Sports. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the following Division I women's sports:

"Badminton ..... 8 6 Soccer ..... 11 12

"Cross Country/Track ..... 16 18 Softball ..... 11 12

"Field Hockey ..... 11 12 Squash ..... 9 5

"Lacrosse ..... 11 12 Team Handball ..... 12 10"

[Remainder of 15.5.3.1.2 unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.3.1.3, page 200, as follows:

[Division I only]

"15.5.3.1.3 Division I Maximum Equivalency Limits — Institutions

that Sponsor Cross Country But Do Not Sponsor Track. There shall be a limit of five on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the sport of **men's** cross country in a gender, if the institution does not sponsor indoor or outdoor track for that gender **men**. **There shall be a limit of six on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the sport of women's cross country, if the institution does not sponsor indoor or outdoor track for women.**"

**Source:** NCAA Council (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** During 1994 and 1995, the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism conducted a thorough study related to appropriate NCAA grant limits. This study included contacting various coaches associations, sports committees and athletics associations for input, as well as the development of basic principles to guide the committee's final recommendations. In particular, the committee found justification to increase limits incrementally in certain existing women's sports, primarily for gender-equity reasons. However, the maximum limits in a few emerging sports appear to be inappropriately high and should be decreased.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

#### NO. 55 (NO. 2-80) FINANCIAL AID — MULTIPLE-SPORT PARTICIPANTS — DIVISION II

**Intent:** In Division II, to permit a multiple-sport student-athlete to practice in the sport of football without having to count against the institution's scholarship limits in football until that student-athlete engages in intercollegiate competition.

**Bylaws:** Amend 15.5.7, page 203, as follows:

[Division II only]

"15.5.7 Multiple-Sport Participants

"15.5.7.1 Football. In Divisions I and II football, a counter who competes in football and one or more sports (including basketball) shall be counted in the sport of football. In Division II, a counter who practices or competes in football and one or more other sports (including basketball) shall be counted in the sport of football.

[15.5.7.2 through 15.5.7.6 unchanged.]

"15.5.7.7 Two-Year Exception. If an individual has participated in a sport other than football in Division II, basketball, field hockey or women's volleyball for two years or more since the individual's initial collegiate enrollment and would be involved only in football in Division II, basketball, field hockey or



women's volleyball practice sessions, such a student would not become a counter in those sports until the student actually competes as a member of that institution's intercollegiate team, at either the varsity or junior varsity level."

[Remainder of 15.5.7 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Division II legislation limits the participation of multisport student-athletes in football by specifying that student-athletes who receive athletically related financial aid in sports other than football and who practice in football must count against the football program's scholarship limits. This proposal provides a multisport student-athlete with the opportunity to participate in Division II football without becoming a counter until the student-athlete actually competes as a member of the institution's team, at either the varsity or junior varsity level.

**Committee Position (Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism):** The committee took no position on this proposal, provided the sponsors make one clarification in the rationale statement. Specifically, the committee asked the sponsors to include the interpretation set forth in Minute No. 7 of the NCAA Interpretations Committee's March 16, 1995, telephone conference, which states that this exception is applicable only to multisport participants who were not recruited and/or offered financial aid to participate in the sport of football.

**Action:** Adopted by Division II.

### Eligibility

NO. 56 (NO. 2-49) **ELIGIBILITY FOR PRACTICE — MINIMUM FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT — UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE/NATIONAL GOVERNING BODY WAIVER**

**Intent:** To permit a student-athlete with eligibility remaining who is not enrolled or who is enrolled in less than a full-time program of studies or a former student-athlete to practice with an institution's team, provided the individual's participation is recommended by the United States Olympic Committee or the national governing body; the practice takes place only at the institution(s) the individual previously attended; the participation involves an individual sport, or the sport of crew or synchronized swimming; the individual does not participate in any coaching activities; and, in the case of a student-athlete with eligibility remaining, the participation occurs during the academic year immediately preceding the Olympic Games.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.1.6.1 by adding new 14.1.6.1.6, page 134, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

**"14.1.6.1.6 Waiver — United States Olympic Committee/ National Governing Body. A student-athlete with eligibility remaining who is not enrolled or who is enrolled in less than a minimum full-time program of studies or a former student-athlete may participate on a regular basis in organized practice sessions, provided the following conditions are met:**

- "(a) The practice sessions take place only at the institution(s) the individual previously attended as an undergraduate;**
- "(b) The practice sessions involve an individual sport, crew or synchronized swimming;**
- "(c) The United States Olympic Committee or national governing body (NGB) in the sport has recommended the individual's participation;**
- "(d) The individual does not participate in any coaching activities unless the institution designates the individual as a coach and counts the individual in the appropriate coaching limits; and**
- "(e) In the case of a student-athlete with NCAA eligibility remaining in the sport, such participation occurs only during the academic year immediately preceding the Olympic Games.**

**"14.1.6.1.6.1 Administration. This waiver shall be approved by the conference members of the Association or, in the case of independent institutions, by the Council. A member institution shall submit a waiver request that includes documentation that demonstrates that the conditions of 14.1.6.1.6 have been met for each individual who wishes to participate in the institution's practice sessions."**

**Source:** NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** This proposal was initiated by a special task force consisting of USOC and NCAA representatives, which was appointed by the USOC to strengthen the relationship and increase cooperation between the USOC and the NCAA. The task force agreed that consideration of some liberalization of NCAA rules related to practice, particularly prior to the 1996 Olympic Games, will be very important to the Olympic movement and prove beneficial for other new initiatives being discussed by the task force.

**Action:** Adopted (with immediate effective date) by Divisions I, II and III.



NO. 57 (NO. 2-51) ELIGIBILITY — SEASONS OF  
COMPETITION — TENNIS

**Intent:** In the sports of Divisions I and II tennis, to specify that a student-athlete who does not enroll in college within one year following the completion of secondary studies shall fulfill an academic year in residence upon initial collegiate enrollment and shall lose a season of competition for each year in which the student has participated in organized tennis competition during each year subsequent to high-school graduation and prior to collegiate enrollment.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.4 by adding new 14.2.4.2, page 138, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

**"14.2.4.2 Tennis. Subsequent to graduating from high-school (or the international equivalent as specified in the NCAA Guide to International Academic Standards for Athletics Eligibility), a student-athlete shall have one year in order to be immediately eligible upon and retain the opportunity for four seasons of competition upon initial, full-time collegiate enrollment. The student also must meet all applicable NCAA, institutional and conference eligibility requirements. A student who does not enroll in a collegiate institution as a full-time student during that one-year time period shall be subject to the following:**

- "(a) The student-athlete shall be charged with a season of intercollegiate tennis eligibility for each calendar year subsequent to graduation from high school (or the international equivalent) and prior to full-time collegiate enrollment during which the student-athlete has participated in organized tennis events (per 14.2.4.4.4).**
- "(b) Upon matriculation at the certifying institution, the student-athlete must fulfill an academic year in residence before being eligible to represent the institution in intercollegiate tennis competition."**

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.1, page 142, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

**"14.3.1 Eligibility for Financial Aid, Practice and Competition. A student-athlete who enrolls in a Division I or Division II institution as an entering freshman with no previous full-time college attendance shall meet the following academic requirements, as certified by an initial-eligibility clearinghouse approved by the Council, and any applicable institutional and conference regulations, to be considered a qualifier and thus be eligible for financial aid, practice and competition during the first academic year in residence. In the sport of tennis, an entering freshman also shall fulfill the eligibility requirements specified in**

**14.2.4.2 to be eligible for competition."**

**Source:** Brigham Young University; University of California, Berkeley; California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; Davidson College; Furman University; Kansas State University; University of Notre Dame; and Texas Christian University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1997; for student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1997.

**Rationale:** This proposal is the result of a recent eligibility survey conducted by the Intercollegiate Tennis Association (the governing body of collegiate tennis). The purpose of this legislation is to eliminate some of the existing inequities in college tennis, while encouraging student-athletes to matriculate in a timely manner and discouraging semi-professional (or professional) tennis players from participating on the collegiate level. Because there is no amateur level of tennis being played in any other part of the world than the United States, and there are large numbers of international players attending American colleges and universities (largely on scholarship), confirming the amateur status of these student-athletes has been extremely difficult and has been a source of great concern among collegiate tennis coaches.

**Committee Position (Eligibility Committee):** The committee took no position on this proposal. The committee believes this is more of a policy decision appropriate for resolution by the entire membership.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I. Motion to refer defeated by Division II, 111-133-2; proposal defeated.

NO. 58 (NO. 2-52) PARTICIPATION AFTER 21ST  
BIRTHDAY

**Intent:** To change the effective date of the "21-year-age rule" from those students first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1995, to those students first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.4.4, page 139, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"14.2.4.4 Participation After 21st Birthday. Any participation as an individual or a team representative in organized sports competition by a student during each 12-month period after the student's 21st birthday and prior to initial full-time enrollment in a collegiate institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport. Participation in organized competition during time spent in the U.S. armed services shall be excepted. (Effective 8/1/95 8/1/96 for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after 8/1/95 8/1/92.)"**

**"14.2.4.4.1 Track and Cross Country. A prospective student-athlete who participates in outside competition after the student's 21st birthday during a cross country, indoor track**



and field or outdoor track and field sports season (as opposed to general road racing events) would be charged with at least one season of competition in the sport in which the student participated. (Effective 8/1/95 **8/1/96** for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after 8/1/95 **8/1/92**.)

"14.2.4.4.2 Road Racing. A prospective student-athlete who participates in road racing activities after the student's 21st birthday and prior to enrollment in a member institution shall be charged with at least one season of competition in each of the sports of cross country, indoor track and outdoor track. (Effective 8/1/95 **8/1/96** for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after 8/1/95 **8/1/92**.)"

[Remainder of 14.2.4.4 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Midwestern Collegiate Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1992.

**Rationale:** The adoption of 1995 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 148 resulted in a much clearer, simpler age rule. It is good legislation and should apply to the small number of student-athletes who already were enrolled in college and penalized by the previous age rule. In effect, changing the effective date will eliminate three classes of "notch" babies.

**Committee Position (Legislative Review Committee):** The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

#### NO. 59 (NO. 2-53) PARTICIPATION AFTER 21ST BIRTHDAY — ICE HOCKEY

**Intent:** To create an exception to the "21-year-age rule" in the sport of ice hockey as specified.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.2.4.4 by adding new 14.2.4.4.3, page 139, as follows:

[Division I only]

"14.2.4.4 Participation After 21st Birthday. Any participation as an individual or a team representative in organized sports competition by a student during each 12-month period after the student's 21st birthday and prior to initial full-time enrollment in a collegiate institution shall count as one year of varsity competition in that sport. Participation in organized competition during time spent in the U.S. armed services shall be excepted.

[14.2.4.4.1 and 14.2.4.4.2 unchanged.]

"14.2.4.4.3 Ice Hockey. In the sport of ice hockey, a student shall not be charged with more than one season of competition in that sport in any 12-month period after the student's 21st birthday. In addition, if in any 12-

month period following the student's 21st birthday the student participates in organized sports competition in that sport, matriculates at a collegiate institution, participates in regular practice sessions, including conditioning activities, and begins a collegiate season, the student may complete that collegiate season without being charged an additional season of competition."

**Source:** University of Alaska Anchorage; Boston College; Colorado College; University of Denver; Ferris State University; Lake Superior State University; University of Maine; University of Massachusetts at Lowell; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; University of New Hampshire; University of North Dakota; Northern Michigan University; and University of Wisconsin, Madison.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for currently enrolled student-athletes as well as student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This legislation will prevent a prospect in the sport of ice hockey who has continued participation in organized noncollegiate competition following his or her 21st birthday from losing a season of competition if the prospect enrolls in a collegiate institution during the 12-month period following his or her 21st birthday.

**Committee Position (Legislative Review Committee):** The committee opposes this proposal, noting that it has the effect of returning to the previous rule, with a different benchmark (21st birthday). The committee noted that its purpose in recommending that the Council sponsor legislation at last year's Convention to amend the legislation to read as it does not was to deregulate and simplify its application, and that going back to the old rule defeats that purpose.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 60 (NO. 2-54) CORE-CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS — EIGHTH-GRADE COURSES

**Intent:** To eliminate the use of eighth-grade courses to satisfy core-curriculum requirements.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.1.3.2, page 146, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.3.1.3.2 Eighth-Grade Courses. A prospective student-athlete shall be permitted to utilize eighth-grade courses to satisfy core-curriculum requirements only if the courses taken in the eighth grade are considered by the high school to be equivalent to courses normally taken in the ninth grade or above."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1996.



**Rationale:** The adoption of legislation to permit the use of eighth-grade courses to meet core-course requirements preceded the creation of the Council Subcommittee on Initial-Eligibility Waivers. If the eighth-grade core-course legislation is deleted, the subcommittee is authorized to consider waiver requests from students who have completed legitimate core courses during the eighth grade, while a potential source of academic abuse will be eliminated.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I and II.

**NO. 61 (NO. 2-58) PARTICIPATION PRIOR TO INITIAL-ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION — NONRECRUITED STUDENT-ATHLETES — WOMEN'S CREW**

**Intent:** To extend the temporary initial-eligibility certification period for student-athletes participating in the sport of women's crew by permitting a nonrecruited student to practice, but not compete, throughout the nontraditional season in that sport.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.3.5.1.2 by adding new 14.3.5.1.2.1, page 151, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

**"14.3.5.1.2.1 Exception — Women's Crew. A nonrecruited student in the sport of women's crew may practice, but not compete, during the nontraditional season in that sport. Thereafter, the student shall have established minimum-eligibility requirements as a qualifier (as certified by the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse) to continue practicing or to compete."**

**Source:** NCAA Council; all members of the Ivy Group; Bucknell University; Colgate University; Georgetown University; College of the Holy Cross; Mercyhurst College; University of New Hampshire; Northeastern University; Rutgers University, New Brunswick; Syracuse University; and Villanova University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Women's crew does not enjoy the same widespread level of participation on the high-school level found in other sports. The vast majority of crew participants at the collegiate level are students who have no crew background whatsoever and, in some cases, have no experience in any sport. Most rowers are walk-ons who are recruited on campus after initial college enrollment. It then takes an inordinate amount of time to teach the basic fundamentals of crew to these prospects, and it takes additional time to convince more promising individuals to stay with the program. It is, therefore, important to allow as much time as possible to expose students to the sport and to encourage their continued participation.

**Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):** The committee opposes this proposal. While the committee believes that the establishment of women's crew has positive rami-

fications for gender equity, it does not favor a sport-specific exception to the temporary-certification period.

**Committee Position (Special Committee to Oversee Implementation of the Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse):** The special committee opposes this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I upon reconsideration. Defeated by Division II.

**NO. 62 (NO. 2-59) SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — CALCULATION OF GRADE-POINT AVERAGE — DIVISION II**

**Intent:** In Division II, to specify that calculation of satisfactory progress grade-point averages for student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1991, shall be based on the student-athletes' academic record only at the certifying institution.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.4.3.3.2.2, page 155, as follows:  
[Division II only]

**"14.4.3.3.2.2 Calculation of Grade-Point Average for Student-Athletes Entering a Collegiate Institution on or After August 1, 1991. For those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 1991, the cumulative minimum grade-point average must be achieved in all grades earned at the certifying institution and in all grades earned in all collegiate institutions based only on course work taken at the certifying institution."**

**Source:** All members of the Peach Belt Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; effective for satisfactory-progress grade-point average calculations that occur on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** NCAA Bylaw 14.4.3.3.2 establishes a minimum grade-point average of 1.600, 1.800 and 2.000 before a student may participate in his or her second, third and final seasons of competition, respectively. The rule as it currently stands requires institutions to review annually a transfer student's grade-point average and average it into the student's grade-point average at the certifying institution. The current rule requires the certifying institution to count all grades in all courses taken at the previous school, including even those courses that are not transferable. This means that courses such as vocational courses or a considerable number of extra physical education courses would have the potential for impacting a student's eligibility. It also means that a student who had earned the number of transferable hours with the required grade-point average and who has performed well at the certifying institution may become ineligible based on grades in nontransferable classes. This legislation would not change the requirements for transferable hours applicable to a transfer student; it simply would base the student-athlete's subsequent certification on his or her academic perfor-



mance only at the certifying institution.

**Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):**

The committee supports this proposal, noting its belief that the current rule generates much confusion and may not be applied consistently. It believes this proposal establishes a more relevant and practical basis upon which the satisfactory progress grade-point average of a Division II student-athlete can be computed.

**Action:** Adopted by Division II.

**NO. 63 (NO. 2-60) ACADEMIC STANDING AND SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — CORRESPONDENCE AND EXTENSION COURSES**

**Intent:** To clarify that the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee, on a case-by-case basis, may continue to evaluate waiver requests related to the use of correspondence and extension courses taken at another institution to fulfill academic-standing and satisfactory-progress requirements.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.4.3.4.5, page 156, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"14.4.3.4.5 Correspondence and Extension Courses From Another Institution. Correspondence, extension and credit-by-examination courses taken from an institution other than the one in which a student-athlete is enrolled as a full-time student shall not be used in determining a student's academic standing or satisfactory progress.

"14.4.3.4.5.1 Waivers. Waivers of this restriction may be granted by the Academic Requirements Committee in response to written requests from member institutions *for the evaluation of specified programs of studies involving the use of such courses.*"

[Remainder of 14.4.3.4.5 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Academic Requirements Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The Academic Requirements Committee has been unable to determine the intent of the provision that is being eliminated from this legislation. If this language is deleted, the committee will continue to review waiver requests related to such course work on a case-by-case basis.

**Action:** Adopted.

**NO. 64 (NO. 2-61) SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — ADDITIONAL WAIVERS**

**Intent:** To permit the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee to consider all waiver requests related to satisfactory progress.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.4.3 by adding new 14.4.3.9, page 158, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.4.3.9 Additional Satisfactory-Progress Waivers. The NCAA Academic Requirements Committee shall have the authority to waive all other satisfactory-progress requirements based on objective evidence that demonstrates circumstances that warrant the waiver of the normal application of those regulations. The committee shall establish the process for granting such waivers and shall report at least annually to the NCAA Council and to the membership the actions taken in summary aggregate form."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Administrative Review Panel).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Currently, the Academic Requirements Committee has only limited jurisdiction related to the 24-hour-per-year/12-hour-per-term component of satisfactory progress, and makes recommendations to the Administrative Review Panel related to such cases. The Administrative Review Panel believes that the members of the Academic Requirements Committee have more expertise than the panel in this area and should make decisions in all of these cases. The current process of obtaining recommendations is unduly time-consuming and not in the best interest of the membership.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I and II.

**NO. 65 (NO. 2-50) GRADUATE STUDENT — ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION**

**Intent:** To permit a student-athlete who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of an institution other than the institution he or she previously attended as an undergraduate to use the one-time transfer exception.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.1.7 by adding new 14.1.7.1, page 136, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.1.7.1 One-Time Transfer Exception. A graduate student who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of an institution other than the institution he or she previously attended as an undergraduate may participate in inter-collegiate athletics if the student fulfills the conditions of the one-time transfer exception set forth in 14.5.5.3.11 and has eligibility remaining per 14.2."

**Source:** California State University, Stanislaus; Lincoln Memorial University; Mankato State University; University of Northern Colorado; Northern Kentucky University; Northern Michigan University; Sonoma State University; and Texas A&M University-Kingsville.



**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996; for those student-athletes who transfer to the certifying institution on or after August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Current legislation allows a student-athlete who is enrolled as an undergraduate to transfer from one four-year institution to another four-year institution and be eligible to compete immediately at the certifying institution, provided the conditions of the one-time transfer exception are met. However, a student-athlete who has received a bachelor's degree and elects to enroll in a graduate program at a different institution is prohibited from participating in intercollegiate athletics, even if the first institution has no objection to the student-athlete competing at the second institution. Further, a student often must transfer in order to enter a graduate program in the field he or she has chosen. The current legislation forces a student-athlete who has eligibility remaining to transfer prior to completing his or her bachelor's degree in order to continue competing. This proposal will permit any student who meets the conditions of the one-time transfer exception to participate in intercollegiate athletics at any collegiate institution following graduation, provided the student has seasons of competition available and time remaining on the student's eligibility clock.

**Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):** The committee supports this proposal, noting its belief that it will reward academic success while being narrow enough to avoid possible recruiting abuses.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 66 (NO. 2-65) SUBVARSITY ELIGIBILITY — DIVISION II

**Intent:** To specify that a transfer student who was not a qualifier shall not be eligible for subvarsity competition during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.4.2.3, page 161, as follows:  
[Division II only]

"14.5.4.2.3 Subvarsity Competition. In Division II institutions, a transfer from a two-year college who has not met the eligibility requirement set forth in 14.5.4.2.1 or 14.5.4.2.2 shall be eligible to compete only at the subvarsity level at the certifying institution. Such subvarsity competition shall count as a season of competition in the sport involved. **A transfer student from a two-year college who was not a qualifier and who has not met the eligibility requirements set forth in 14.5.4.2.2 shall not be eligible to compete at the subvarsity level during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution.**"

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.5.2, page 163, as follows:  
[Division II only]

"14.5.5.2 Subvarsity Competition. A transfer student from a four-

year institution **who was a qualifier** shall be eligible to compete immediately at the subvarsity level only at the certifying Division II institution prior to meeting the transfer eligibility requirements. Such subvarsity competition shall count as a season of competition in the sport involved. **A transfer student from a four-year institution who was not a qualifier shall not be eligible to compete at the subvarsity level during the first academic year in residence at the certifying institution.**"

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** To permit a transfer student who was not a qualifier to participate in subvarsity competition during the first academic year in residence is inconsistent with the intent of the transfer-residence requirement and should be precluded.

**Action:** Adopted (with immediate effective date) by Division II.

#### NO. 67 (NO. 2-68) "4-2-4" TRANSFER ELIGIBILITY — TWO-YEAR NONPARTICIPATION EXCEPTION

**Intent:** To modify the "4-2-4" transfer rule to permit a student-athlete to be eligible immediately at the second four-year institution upon transfer, provided the student meets the provisions of the two-year nonparticipation exception applicable to "4-4" transfers.

**Bylaws:** Amend 14.5.6, page 166, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"14.5.6 '4-2-4' College Transfers. A student who transfers from a four-year college to a two-year college and then to the certifying institution shall complete one calendar year of residence at the certifying institution, unless the student:

[14.5.6-(a) through 14.5.6-(c) unchanged.]

**"(d) For a consecutive two-year period immediately prior to the date on which the student begins participation (practice and/or competition), has neither practiced nor competed in the involved sport in intercollegiate competition, or has neither practiced nor competed in organized noncollegiate amateur competition while enrolled as a full-time student in a collegiate institution. This two-year period does not include any period of time prior to the student's initial collegiate enrollment."**

[Remainder of 14.5.6 unchanged.]

**Source:** California State University, Stanislaus; Lincoln Memorial University; Mankato State University; University of North Dakota; University of Northern Colorado; Northern Kentucky University; Northern Michigan University; Sonoma State University; South Dakota State University; Texas A&M University-Kingsville; and Wayne State College (Nebraska).



**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** There are many situations in which a student-athlete attends a four-year institution and must leave the institution for reasons that are unrelated to intercollegiate athletics (e.g., financial, family, or medical hardship). The student often enrolls as a full-time student in a two-year college that is less expensive and closer to home, unaware of the effect this action may have on his or her future intercollegiate athletics eligibility. Often the student subsequently is able to attend a different four-year institution to complete his or her education but is unaware that graduation from the two-year college is required in order to be eligible to compete in athletics at the four-year institution. Under these circumstances, the student must complete a residency of one calendar year at the second four-year institution before he or she is eligible to compete. If the student has not competed in intercollegiate athletics for a two-year period, there would be no advantage gained by allowing the student to be immediately eligible to compete at the second four-year institution.

**Committee Position (Academic Requirements Committee):**

The committee took no position on this proposal but noted the likely difficulty in tracking a student-athlete's participation at a two-year college or multiple colleges during the prior two-year period.

**Committee Position (Two-Year College Relations Committee):**

The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Not moved in Division I. Adopted by Division II.

**NO. 68 (NO. 2-107) ELIGIBILITY FOR CHAMPIONSHIPS  
— USE OF BANNED DRUGS**

**Intent:** To specify that a second positive test for an NCAA banned substance (except for a street drug) will result in permanent loss of eligibility, regardless of whether the second positive test occurs during or after the initial period of ineligibility.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 18.4.1.5.1, page 339, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"18.4.1.5.1 Duration of Ineligibility. A student-athlete who tests positive (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one season of competition in all sports if the season of competition has not yet begun for that student-athlete or a minimum of the equivalent of one full season of competition in all sports if the student-athlete tests positive during his or her season of competition (i.e., the remainder of contests in the current season and contests in the subsequent season up to the period of time in which the student-athlete was declared ineligible during the previous year). The student-athlete shall remain ineligible for all regular-season and postseason competition during

the time period ending one calendar year (i.e., 365 days) after the student-athlete's positive drug test, and until the student-athlete retests negative (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) and the student-athlete's eligibility is restored by the Eligibility Committee. If the student-athlete tests positive **a second time** for the use of any drug, other than a 'street drug' as defined in 31.2.3.1, *after being restored to eligibility*, he or she shall lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of a 'street drug' after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one additional season of competition in all sports and also shall remain ineligible for regular-season and postseason competition at least through the next calendar year."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 31.2.3, pages 434-435, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"31.2.3 Ineligibility for Use of Banned Drugs. Bylaw 18.4.1.5 provides that a student-athlete who is found to have utilized a substance on the list of banned drugs shall be declared ineligible for further participation in postseason and regular-season competition during the time period ending one calendar year after the student-athlete's positive drug test, and shall be charged with the loss of a minimum of one season of competition in all sports if the season of competition has not yet begun for that student-athlete or a minimum of the equivalent of one full season of competition in all sports if the student-athlete tests positive during his or her season of competition (i.e., the remainder of contests in the current season and contests in the subsequent season up to the period of time in which the student-athlete was declared ineligible during the previous year). The student-athlete shall remain ineligible until the student-athlete retests negative (in accordance with the testing methods authorized by the Executive Committee) and the student-athlete's eligibility is restored by the Eligibility Committee. If the student-athlete tests positive **a second time** for the use of any drug, other than a 'street drug' as defined below, *after being restored to eligibility*, he or she shall lose all remaining regular-season and postseason eligibility in all sports. If the student-athlete tests positive for the use of a 'street drug' after being restored to eligibility, he or she shall lose a minimum of one additional season of competition in all sports and also shall remain ineligible for regular-season and postseason competition at least through the next calendar year. Bylaw 18.4.1.5 also provides that the Executive Committee shall adopt a list of banned drugs and authorize methods for drug testing of student-athletes on a year-round basis."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** A second positive drug test for a banned substance (ex-



cept a street drug) should result in a permanent loss of eligibility, regardless of whether the second test occurs during or after the student's initial period of ineligibility.

**Action:** Part A adopted by Divisions I, II and III. Part B adopted.

## Playing and Practice Seasons

### NO. 69 (NO. 2-93) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I

**Intent:** In Division I, to require that specified events be certified by the Special Events Committee in order to be exempted from an institution's maximum number of contests/dates of competition; to expand the duties of the Special Events Committee to include the certification of such events; to expand the membership of the committee to include representatives of Divisions I-AA and I-AAA; and to establish a new schedule for contest exemptions.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.5.2 through 17.3.5.5, pages 248-251, as follows:

[Division I only]

#### "17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions — Basketball

**"17.3.5.2.1 Certification Required.** In order for the following contest to be exempted from a Division I institution's maximum number of basketball contests, it shall be certified annually by the Special Events Committee (see 30.10.1).

**"(a) National Invitation Tournament.** Contests in the postseason National Invitation Tournament.

**"(b) National Women's Invitational Tournament.** Contests in the National Women's Invitational Tournament."

**"17.3.5.2.2 Certification Not Required.** The following basketball contests each year may be exempted from a Division I institution's maximum number of contests:

**"(a) Postseason Tournament.** Contests in one postseason basketball tournament (e.g., NCAA championships, NAIA championship, *National Invitation Tournament*). A postseason tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season.

[17.3.5.2-(b) through 17.3.5.2-(d), renumbered as 17.3.5.2.2-(b) through 17.3.5.2.2-(d), unchanged.]

**"(e) Foreign Team in U.S.** A home exhibition contest against a foreign team in the United States. **In Division I, an institution may play two home exhibition contests against**

**a foreign team in the United States during any year in which it does not utilize the exemption set forth in 17.3.5.2.2-(f) or may play one home exhibition contest against a foreign team in the United States and one home exhibition contest against a 'club' member of USA Basketball;**

**"(f) USA Basketball Club.** For Divisions I and II only, a home exhibition contest against a 'club' member of USA Basketball. **In Division I, an institution may play two home exhibition contests against a 'club' member of USA Basketball during any year in which it does not utilize the exemption set forth in 17.3.5.2.2-(e) or may play one home exhibition contest against a 'club' member of USA Basketball and one home exhibition contest against a foreign team in the United States;**

**"(g) Tip-Off Classic.** For Division I only, the men's or women's Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game;

**"(h) Martin Luther King Classic.** For Division I only, contests in the Martin Luther King Classic. Participation in the Classic shall be limited, by institution, to once in any four-year period and, by conference, to one institution from a member conference per Classic; and

**"(g) Alaska or Hawaii Contest.** One regular-season game in Alaska or Hawaii versus a member institution located in that state;

[17.3.5.2-(i) relettered as 17.3.5.2.2-(h), unchanged.]

#### "17.3.5.3 Once-in-Four Years Exemptions

**"17.3.5.3.1 Division I Foreign-Tour Option.** Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution may exempt from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests the games played on a foreign basketball tour certified in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (also see 17.23), provided the foreign tour is not taken in the same academic year (or the summer immediately thereafter) in which the member institution utilizes any of the exemptions provided in 17.3.5.3.2.

#### "17.3.5.3.2 17.3.5.3.1 Additional Division I Options **Once-in-Four-Years Exemption.**

**17.3.5.3.2.1 17.3.5.3.1.1 Basic Options Certification Required.** Not more than one every four years a Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests **during any academic year and may not participate again in that event within a four-year period, provided the event is certified by the Special Events Committee (see 30.10.1).**

**"(a) Alaska Contests (Other Than Great Alaska Shootout) Tournament.** Not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Alaska) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests) other than the Great Alaska Shootout, by a member institution located outside the area in question, either



against or under the sponsorship of an active member located in Alaska. **A tournament sponsored by a member institution in Alaska (e.g., Great Alaska Shootout);**

“(b) **Puerto Rico Contests Tournament.** Not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Puerto Rico) or one tournament (not to exceed four contests), by a member institution located outside of Puerto Rico, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member located in Puerto Rico; **A tournament sponsored by a member institution in Puerto Rico (e.g., San Juan Shootout);**

“(c) **Preseason National Invitation Tournament and Preseason Women’s National Invitation Tournament.** The games played in the Preseason National Invitation Tournament and the Preseason Women’s National Invitation Tournament;

“(d) **Tip-Off Classic.** The men’s or women’s Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game;

“(e) **Hawaii Tournament — Division I.** A tournament sponsored by a Division I member institution in Hawaii (e.g., Rainbow Classic);

“(f) **Hawaii Tournament — Division II.** A tournament sponsored by a Division II member institution in Hawaii (e.g., Maui Invitational); and

“(g) **Martin Luther King Classic.** A contest in the Martin Luther King Classic.

**“17.3.5.3.1.2 Certification Not Required.** A Division I member institution may exempt not more than one of the following during any academic year and may not participate again in that event within a four-year period.

“(a) **Certified NCAA Approved Foreign Tour.** The games played on a foreign basketball tour certified conducted in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (also see 17.23).

“17.3.5.3.2.2 **Competition Hosted by Division I Member Institution in Hawaii.** Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution located outside of Hawaii may exempt not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests), either against or under the sponsorship of an active Division I member institution located in Hawaii.

“17.3.5.3.2.3 **Competition Hosted by Division II Member Institution in Hawaii.** Not more than once every four years, a Division I member institution located outside of Hawaii may exempt not more than one contest (or four contests if scheduled on a single, regular-season trip to Hawaii) or one tournament (not to exceed three contests), either against or under the sponsorship of an active Division II member located in Hawaii.

“17.3.5.3.3 **17.3.5.3.2 Conference Exception.** The limitations

under 17.3.5.3.2.1-(a) and (b) **17.3.5.2.2-(g)** shall not apply to regular-season contests between two members of the same NCAA conference.

[17.3.5.3.4 and 17.3.5.3.5 renumbered as 17.3.5.3.3 and 17.3.5.3.4, unchanged.]

[17.3.5.4 unchanged.]

“17.3.5.5 **Once-In-Twelve-Years Exemption — Great Alaska Shootout.** Not more than once every 12 years, a Division I member institution located outside Alaska may exempt participation in the Great Alaska Shootout (not to exceed three contests).”

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.7.3, pages 266-267, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

“17.7.3 **First Contest.** In Divisions I and II, a member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football prior to September 1 (or the preceding Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday) except, in **Division I**, when selected to participate in the National Football Foundation benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game, both sponsored by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics **a preseason game approved by the Special Events Committee (see 30.10)** and played in the week prior to the beginning of the regular playing season in football. In Division III, a member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football prior to the Friday or Saturday 11 weeks before the first round of the NCAA Division III Football Championship.”

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.7.5, pages 267-269, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

“17.7.5 **Number of Contests**

[17.7.5.1 unchanged.]

“17.7.5.2 **Annual Exemptions.** The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-10):

[17.7.5.2-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) **Football Hall of Fame Game/Coaches Retirement Trust Game.** The National Football Foundation Hall of Fame benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game;

[17.7.5.2-(c) through 17.7.5.2-(p), relettered as 17.7.5.2-(b) through 17.7.5.2-(n), unchanged.]

“17.7.5.3 **Once-in-Eight-Years Exemption.** Once every eight years, a Division I institution may participate in one exempted preseason football contest certified by the Special Events Committee (see 17.7.3 and 30.10).”

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.8.4.2, pages 273-275, as follows:

[Division I only]



"17.8.4.2 Annual Exemptions — **Golf**. The Maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of golf shall exclude the following:

"17.8.4.2.1 **Certification Required**. In order for a Division I institution to exempt the following dates of competition from its maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of golf, they shall be certified by the Special Events Committee (see 30.10.3).

"(a) **East-West All-Star Match**. The participation of a member or members of an institution's golf team in the East-West all-star golf match at the site of the NCAA division golf championships on the day preceding the start of the competition (i.e., the practice-round day); and

"(b) **Sun Bowl All-American Classic**. Participation in the Sun Bowl All-American Classic, provided not more than two student-athletes from the institution participate in that event.

"17.8.4.2.2 **Certification Not Required**.

[17.8.4.2-(a) through 17.8.4.2-(f) renumbered as 17.8.4.2.2-(a) through 17.8.4.2.2-(f), unchanged.]

"(g) **Certified Foreign Tour — Divisions I and II**. The dates of competition in golf on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a four-year period and is certified by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (also see 17.23).

[17.8.4.2-(h) renumbered as 17.8.4.2.2-(g), unchanged.]

"(i) **(h) Hawaii, or Alaska, Puerto Rico—Divisions I and II**. Any dates of competition in golf in Hawaii, or Alaska or Puerto Rico respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active Division I member institution located in Hawaii, or Alaska or Puerto Rico, by a member located outside the area in question;

[17.8.4.2-(j) renumbered as 17.8.4.2.2-(i), unchanged.]

"(m) **(j) National Championships and International Competition**. Competition in national championships and international golf competition, provided the student-athlete(s) is not representing the member institution in the competition and receives no more than actual and necessary expenses (including entry fees) from the member institution.

"(p) **(k) College-Am Event**. A "college-am" golf tournament, provided the event is held in conjunction with intercollegiate competition and student-athletes do not receive awards or prizes for such participation.

"(l) **Conference Playoff**. Conference playoff competition involving member institutions that tie for a conference championship. Such teams may participate in a single-conference championship playoff to determine the conference's automatic entry into an NCAA cham-

pionship without the contest(s) being counted as a postseason tournament.

"(m) **U.S. National Team**. One date of competition against the U.S. national team as selected by the appropriate national governing body in the sport of golf.

"17.8.4.3 **Once-in-Four Years Exemptions — Certification Not Required**. A Division I institution may exempt from its maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of golf not more than one of the following during any academic year and may not repeat participation in that event within a four-year period:

"(a) **Certified NCAA Approved Foreign Tour — Divisions I and II**. The dates of competition in golf on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a four-year period and is certified conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (also see 17.23);

"17.8.4.4 **Once-In-Four Years Exemptions — Certification Required**. A Division I institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of golf during any academic year and may not participate again in that event within a four-year period, provided the event is certified by the Special Events Committee (see 30.10.3).

"(a) **Hawaii Tournament and/or Competition**. Any dates of tournament competition in golf played in Hawaii, under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii, or nontournament competition against a non-Division I member located in Hawaii, by a member located outside the area in question;

"(b) **Alaska Tournament and/or Competition**. Any dates of tournament competition in golf in Alaska under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Alaska, or nontournament competition against a non-Division I member located in Alaska, by a member located outside the area in question;

"(c) **Puerto Rico Tournament and/or Competition**. Any dates of tournament competition in golf in Puerto Rico, under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Puerto Rico or nontournament competition against a non-Division I member located in Puerto Rico, by a member located outside the area in question;"

E. **Bylaws**: Amend 17.15.5.3, pages 301-303, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.15.5.3 **Annual Exemptions — Softball**. The maximum number of softball contests shall exclude the following:



**"17.15.5.3.1 Certification Required.** In order for a Division I institution to exempt the following softball contests from its maximum number of contests, they shall be certified by the Special Events Committee (see 30.10.3).

**"(a) National Invitational Championship.** Competition in the National Invitational Softball Championship.

**"17.15.5.3.2 Certification Not Required.**

[17.15.5.3-(a) through 17.15.5.3-(e) renumbered as 17.15.5.3.1-(b) through 17.15.5.3.1-(f), unchanged and 17.15.5.3-(g) and (h) renumbered as 17.15.5.3.1-(g) and (h), unchanged.]

*"(j) Certified Foreign Tour — Divisions I and II. The softball games played on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a four-year period and is certified by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (also see 17.23);*

[17.15.5.3-(j) renumbered as 17.15.5.3.1-(j), unchanged.]

**"(k) Hawaii, or Alaska, Puerto Rico-Divisions I and II.** Any softball games played in Hawaii, or Alaska, or Puerto Rico respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active Division I member institution located in Hawaii, or Alaska or Puerto Rico, by a member located outside the area in question;

[17.15.5.3-(l) through 17.15.5.3-(o) renumbered as 17.15.5.3.1-(l) through 17.15.5.3.1-(o), unchanged.]

**"(p) U.S. National Team.** One date of competition against the U.S. national team as selected by the appropriate national governing body in the sport of softball.

**"17.15.5.4 Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions — Certification Not Required.** A Division I institution may exempt not more than one of the following from its maximum number of softball contests during any academic year and may not repeat participation in that event within a four-year period:

**"(a) NCAA Approved Foreign Tour.** The softball games played on a foreign tour, provided the tour is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (also see 17.23);

**"17.15.5.5 Once-in-Four-Years Exemption — Certification Required.** A Division I institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of softball during any academic year and may not participate again in that event within a four-year period, provided the event is certified by the Special Events Committee (see 30.10.3).

**"(a) Hawaii Sponsored Tournament and/or Competition.** Any softball tournament games played in Hawaii, under the sponsorship of an active member institu-

tion located in Hawaii or nontournament competition against a non-Division I member located in Hawaii, by a member located outside the area in question;

**"(b) Alaska Sponsored Tournament and/or Competition.** Any softball tournament games played in Alaska, under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Alaska, or nontournament competition against a non-Division I member located in Alaska, by a member located outside the area in question;

**"(c) Puerto Rico Sponsored Tournament and/or Competition.** Any softball tournament games played in Puerto Rico, under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Puerto Rico or nontournament competition against a non-Division I member located in Puerto Rico, by a member located outside the area in question;"

**F. Bylaws:** Amend 17.19.9, pages 322-323, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"17.19.9 Annual Exemptions — Volleyball.** The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of volleyball shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-22):

**"17.19.9.1 Certification Required.** In order for a Division I institution to exempt the following dates of competition from its maximum number of dates of competition in volleyball, they shall be certified by the Special Events Committee (see 30.10.3).

**"(a) National Invitational Volleyball Championship — Division I.** Dates of competition in the National Invitational Volleyball Championship.

**"17.19.9.2 Certification Not Required.**

[17.19.9-(a) through 17.19.9-(d) renumbered as 17.19.9.2-(a) through 17.19.9.2-(d), unchanged, and 17.19.9-(f) and 17.19.9-(g) renumbered as 17.19.9.2-(e) and 17.19.9.2-(f), unchanged.]

*"(h) Certified Foreign Tour — Divisions I and II Men and Women and Division III men. The dates of competition in volleyball on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a four-year period and is certified by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (also see 17.23);*

[17.19.9-(i) renumbered as 17.19.9.2-(i), unchanged.]

**"(j) Hawaii, or Alaska, Puerto Rico-Divisions I and II Men and Women and Division III Men.** Any dates of competition in volleyball in Hawaii, or Alaska or Puerto Rico respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active Division I member institution located in Hawaii, or Alaska or Puerto Rico, by a member located outside the area in question;

[17.19.9-(k) through 17.19.9-(n) renumbered as 17.19.9.2-(k) through 17.19.9.2-(n), unchanged.]

**"(o) U.S. National Team.** One date of competition against the U.S. national team as selected by the appropriate



national governing body for volleyball.

**"17.19.10 Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions — Certification Not Required.** A Division I institution may exempt not more than one of the following from its maximum number of dates of competition in volleyball during any academic year and may not repeat participation in that event within a four-year period:

**"(a) NCAA Approved Foreign Tour.** The dates of competition in volleyball played on a foreign tour, provided the tour is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (also see 17.23);

**"17.19.11 Once-in-Four-Years Exemptions — Certification Required.** A Division I institution may exempt not more than one of the following from its maximum number of dates of competition in volleyball and may not repeat participation in that event within a four-year period, provided the event is certified by the Special Events Committee.

**"(a) Division I — NACWAA Volleyball Classic.** In Division I, competition in the NACWAA Volleyball Classic

**"(b) Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico Sponsored Tournaments and/or Competitions.** Any dates of tournament competition in volleyball played in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico respectively, under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico or non-tournament competition against a non-Division I member located in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, by a member located outside the area in question;"

**G. Bylaws:** Amend 17.5.3, pages 242-333, for all sports except basketball, football, golf, softball and volleyball by amending the section entitled "Annual Exemptions," as follows:

[Division I only]

**"17.5.3 Annual Exemptions.** The maximum number of contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-):

[17.5.3-(a) through 17.5.3-(g) unchanged.]

**"(h) Certified Foreign Tour — Divisions I and II.** The games on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a four-year period and is certified by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (also see 17.23);

[17.5.3-(i) unchanged.]

**"(j) Hawaii, or Alaska, Puerto Rico — Divisions I and II Men and Women and Division III Men.** Any games played in Hawaii, or Alaska or Puerto Rico respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active **Division I** member institution located in Hawaii, or Alaska or Puerto Rico, by a member located outside the area in

question;

[17.5.3-(k) through 17.5.3-(n) unchanged.]

**"(o) U.S. National Team.** One game played against the U.S. national team as selected by the appropriate national governing body for the applicable sport.

**"17.5.3.1 Once-in-Four Years Exemptions — Certification Required.** A Division I institution may exempt not more than one of the following from its maximum number of contests during any academic year and may not repeat participation in that event within a four-year period, provided the contest is certified by the Special Events Committee:

**"(a) Hawaii Sponsored Tournament and/or Competition.** Any tournament contests played in Hawaii under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii by a member located outside the area in question;

**"(b) Alaska Sponsored Tournament and/or Competition.** Any tournament contests played in Alaska under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Alaska by a member located outside the area in question;

**"(c) Puerto Rico Sponsored Tournament and/or Competition.** Any tournament contests played in Puerto Rico under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Puerto Rico by a member located outside the area in question;

**"17.5.3.2 Once-in-Four Years Exemptions — Certification Not Required.**

**"(a) NCAA-Approved Foreign Tour.** The contests played on a foreign tour, provided the tour is conducted by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (also see 17.23);"

**H. Bylaws:** Amend 17.23, pages 333-334, by adding new 17.2.3.1.2, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"17.23.1.2 Timing of Tour.** A foreign tour taken during the summer vacation period shall be considered to have occurred during the academic year subsequent to the summer for purposes of Bylaws 17 and 30.10.

**I. Bylaws:** Amend 21.3.27, page 390, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

**"21.3.27 Special Events Committee**

**"21.3.27.1 Composition.** The Special Events Committee shall consist of 12 18 members, all 12 of whom shall represent Division I-A institutions, including at least one from each con-



ference whose primary representative participates in a certified postseason football game that is in full compliance with Executive Regulation 31.5.1. **The Division I-A members shall administer Division I-A football matters. Three members of the committee shall represent Division I-AA institutions and three members of the committee shall represent Division I-AAA institutions.** The committee shall include at least two women.

"21.3.27.2 Duties. The committee shall be responsible for issues involving postseason football contests and, college all-star football and basketball contests and exempted contests."

- J. Bylaws:** Amend 30 by adding new 30.10, page 417, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

#### **"30.10 CONTEST EXEMPTIONS**

"In order for a Division I institution to exempt specified contests from its maximum number of contests within Bylaw 17, the contests shall be certified annually by the Special Events Committee as meeting the following conditions.

**"30.10.1 Basketball Exemptions.** The following criteria must be satisfied for an exempted basketball contest to receive certification from the Special Events Committee.

**"30.10.1.1 Competitive and Cultural Experience.** Each exempted event must provide participating student-athletes a unique competitive and/or cultural experience. The committee will review an annual report submitted by the event to determine whether the event meets this criterion.

**"30.10.1.2 Sponsoring Agency.** The sponsoring organization of any exempted event shall be either an active or affiliated member of the Association.

**"30.10.1.3 Management of Event.** Each exempted event must demonstrate that its administration is experienced in managing basketball events, that competition is conducted in a manner compatible with Division I standards and that it is financially sound. If the Special Events Committee has reason to doubt an event's ability to pay the expenses of the competing institutions as required by 30.10.1.6, it may require event management to post a letter of credit in an amount sufficient to cover all such expenses. An NCAA member institution participating in the administration of the exempted event must participate in establishing and approving its budget.

**"30.10.1.3.1 Participation by Division I Institution.** Each exempted event must have at least one Division I institution directly participating in the management of the event for contests played within the 48 contiguous states. For exempted events in Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico, at least one NCAA institution in any division shall serve in this capacity. In either instance the member institution managing the event also must compete in the event.

**"30.10.1.4 Financial Report.** An annual financial report must be filed by the sponsoring organization on a form and by a date approved by the Council.

**"30.10.1.5 Conference Representation.** No more than one team from any Division I conference may participate in any one preseason or in-season exempted event during any academic year.

**"30.10.1.6 Reimbursement of Expenses.** Each exempted event shall, at a minimum, reimburse the expenses of each Division I participating institution as follows:

**"(a) Travel Party —** The size of the official travel party, for which reimbursement shall be made, shall be 18 individuals;

**"(b) Travel —** Exempted events shall provide a minimum of 50 percent of the official travel party's actual air fare and/or ground transportation expenses within a three-year period.

**"(c) Lodging —** Exempted events shall provide lodging for the official travel party for each day of the event, plus one travel day. Rooming assignments shall not exceed three persons per room.

**"(d) Per Diem —** Exempted events shall provide \$30 per day for each member of the official travel party.

**"30.10.1.6.1 Exception.** There shall be an exception to the reimbursement of expense requirements listed above for any nontournament, regular-season event in Alaska and/or Hawaii.

**"30.10.1.7 Missed Class Time.** An exempted event shall be scheduled to minimize lost class time for participating student-athletes.

**"30.10.1.8 Officials.** Officials for the exempted event shall be assigned from an agency that regularly assigns officials for Division I institutions, and the officials shall be experienced in officiat-



ing Division I basketball contests.

**"30.10.2 Football Exemptions.** The following criteria must be satisfied for an exempted preseason football game to receive certification from the Special Events Committee.

**"30.10.2.1 Financial Report.** An annual financial report must be filed by the sponsoring organization on a form and by a date approved by the Council.

**"30.10.2.2 Eight-Year Period.** A Division I institution may participate in such an exempted preseason football contest not more than once during any eight-year period.

**"30.10.2.3 Missed Class Time.** An exempted event shall be scheduled to minimize lost class time for participating student-athletes. If classes are in session at the time of participation, an institution's team shall not arrive at the contest site more than 48 hours prior to the event.

**"30.10.2.4 Reimbursement of Expenses.** Each exempted event shall, at a minimum, reimburse each Division I participating institution as follows:

**"30.10.2.4.1 Distribution of Income.** Each exempted event shall, at a minimum, distribute 50 percent of the gross income from the event to the participating institutions.

**"30.10.2.4.2 Host Institution.** Each institution participating in an exempted event shall be paid the same amount. However, a host member institution shall be awarded 10 percent of the gross income from the event as an honorarium, but may not receive additional income from parking, concessions, programs or other items sold in conjunction with the event. Such income shall be either included in the gross income or deducted as an offset from the distribution due the host.

**"30.10.2.5 Officials.** Officials for the exempted event shall be assigned from an agency that regularly assigns officials for Division I-A institutions, and the officials shall be experienced in officiating Division I-A football contests.

**"30.10.2.6 Conference Representation.** No more than one team from any Division I conference may participate in a preseason exempted football event during an academic year.

**"30.10.3 Sports Other than Basketball and Football.** The following criteria must be satisfied for an ex-

empted contest to receive certification from the Special Events Committee in sports other than basketball and football.

**"30.10.3.1 Competitive and Cultural Experience.** Each exempted event must provide participating student-athletes a unique competitive and/or cultural experience. The committee will review an annual report submitted by the event to determine whether the event meets this criterion.

**"30.10.3.2 Sponsoring Agency.** The sponsoring organization shall be either an active or affiliated member of the Association."

**"30.10.3.3 Management of Event.** Each exempted event must demonstrate that its administration is experienced in managing such events, that competition is conducted in a manner compatible with Division I standards and that it is financially sound. If the Special Events Committee has reason to doubt an event's ability to pay the expenses of the competing institutions, it may require event management to post a letter of credit in an amount sufficient to cover all such expenses. An NCAA member institution participating in the administration of the exempted event must participate in establishing and approving its budget.

**"30.10.3.3.1 Participation by Division I Institution.** Each exempted event must have at least one Division I institution directly participating in the management of the event for contests played within the 48 contiguous states. For exempted events in Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico, at least one NCAA institution in any division shall serve in this capacity. In either instance, the member institution managing the event also must compete in the event.

**"30.10.3.4 Financial Report.** An annual financial report must be filed by the sponsoring organization on a form and by a date approved by the Council.

**"30.10.3.5 Conference Representation.** No more than one team from any Division I conference may participate in any one preseason or in-season exempted event during any academic year. This conference limitation does not apply to post-season events.

**"30.10.3.6 Reimbursement of Expenses.** Each exempted event shall, at a minimum, reimburse the expenses of each Division I participating institu-



tion as follows:

"(a) **Travel Party**—The size of the official travel party, for which reimbursement shall be made, shall be:

"Baseball	27
"Fencing	12
"Field Hockey	23
"Golf	6
"Gymnastics-Men	11
"Gymnastics-Women	14
"Ice Hockey	26
"Lacrosse	26
"Rifle	10
"Skiing	10
"Soccer	23
"Softball	23
"Swimming	20
"Tennis	8
"Track & field	30
"Volleyball	18
"Water polo	19
"Wrestling	12

"(b) **Travel** — Exempted events shall provide a minimum of 50 percent of the official travel party's actual air fare and/or ground transportation expenses within a three-year period.

"(c) **Lodging** — Exempted events shall provide lodging for the official travel party for each day of the event, plus one travel day. Rooming assignments shall not exceed three persons per room.

"(d) **Per Diem** — Exempted events shall provide \$30 per day for each member of the official travel party.

"30.10.3.6.1 **Exception.** There shall be an exception to the reimbursement of expense requirements listed above for any non-tournament, regular-season event in Alaska and/or Hawaii.

"30.10.3.7 **Missed Class Time.** An exempted event should be scheduled to minimize lost class time for the participating student-athletes."

[Note: Appropriate editorial revisions will be made in Bylaw 17 to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (NCAA Special Committee to Review Con-

test Exemptions).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996. [Note: Those contracts between member institutions and events for participation in exempted events during 1995-96, 1996-97, 1997-98 and 1998-99 may be honored, provided they were in effect on or before September 23, 1995. Events must be certified according to the criteria set forth in this legislation, effective August 1, 1996.]

**Rationale:** The NCAA Special Committee to Review Contest Exemptions was created as a result of concerns expressed related to the increasing number of events that are exempted from the contest limitations within Bylaw 17. The special committee's proposal represents a significant increase in the demands on the sponsoring organizations of exempted events, highlighted by the creation of a certification program. The new criteria will prohibit parlaying of exemptions in a single season by an institution, will reduce or eliminate competitive inequities that exist and restore some of the integrity related to limitations on the playing season. With its oversight responsibilities, the NCAA Special Events Committee will evaluate each exempted event to determine whether it meets the applicable criteria and is worthwhile for the participating student-athletes and institutions; and can recommend adjustments in the criteria for certification. Opportunities for participation will be available to more institutions; thus, the full Division I membership will benefit from such a program. The results of these changes should be a reduction in missed class time and a more enjoyable and rewarding experience for the participating student-athletes.

**Action:** Parts A, D, E, F, G, H and J adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 69-1 and 69-3. Parts B and C adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA as amended by No. 69-1.

#### NO. 69-1 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION J

**Intent:** To permit a Division I institution to participate in an exempted preseason football contest once every four years.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 69-C, 17.7.5.3, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"17.7.5.3 **Once-in-Eight Four-Years Exemption.** Once every *eight* **four** years, a Division I institution may participate in one exempted preseason football contest certified by the Special Events Committee (see 17.7.3 and 30.10)."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 69-J, 30.10.2.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"30.10.2.2 **Eight Four-Year Period.** A Division I institution may participate in such an exempted preseason football contest not more than once during any *eight* **four-year** period."



**Source:** University of Arizona; Baylor University; Boston College; Florida State University; University of Georgia; University of Michigan; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Ohio State University; University of Pittsburgh; Rutgers University, New Brunswick; Southern Methodist University; Texas Christian University; U.S. Naval Academy; and University of Washington.

**Rationale:** This proposal will accommodate for the diminishing number of eligible institutions and provide for a competitive gate and a viable television audience.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I-A and I-AA.

#### NO. 69-2 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I

**Intent:** In the sport of women's basketball, to exempt from reimbursement of expense requirements any regular-season tournament either against or under the sponsorship of an active NCAA member institution located in Alaska and/or Hawaii.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 69-J, 30.10.1.6.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"30.10.1.6.1 Exception. There shall be an exception to the reimbursement of expense requirements listed above for any non-tournament, regular-season event in Alaska and/or Hawaii **and in women's basketball for any regular-season tournament either against or under the sponsorship of an active NCAA member institution located in Alaska and/or Hawaii.**"

**Source:** Brigham Young University; Colorado State University; University of Hawaii, Manoa; San Diego State University; San Jose State University; University of Texas, El Paso; U.S. Air Force Academy; Utah State University; and University of Wyoming.

**Rationale:** Member institutions in Alaska and Hawaii use contest exemptions to assist in meeting their NCAA scheduling requirements. If these institutions are not able to schedule contests at home, they will be forced to travel more, creating a greater expense for the program as well as more classes missed for the student-athletes.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 69-3 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I

**Intent:** To specify that an institution hosting an exempt preseason football event must participate in the event to share event receipts.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 69-J, 30.10.2.4.2, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"30.10.2.4.2 Host **Participating** Institution. Each institution participating in an exempted event shall be paid the same amount. However, a host *member participating* institution shall be awarded 10 percent of the gross income from the event as an honorarium, but may not receive additional income from parking, concessions, programs or other items sold in conjunction with the event. Such income shall be either included in the gross income or deducted as an offset from the distribution due the host. **A host institution that does not participate in the event shall not share event receipts.**"

**Source:** University of Arizona; Baylor University; Boston College; Florida State University; University of Georgia; University of Michigan; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Ohio State University; University of Pittsburgh; Rutgers University, New Brunswick; Southern Methodist University; Texas Christian University; U.S. Naval Academy; and University of Washington.

**Rationale:** A third-party institution that does not participate in an exempted event should not share event receipts.

**Action:** Adopted in Divisions I-A and I-AA.

#### NO. 69-4 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I

**Intent:** To eliminate the restriction that not more than one team from any one Division I conference may participate in each exempt preseason football event during the same academic year.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 69-J, 30.10.2.6, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"30.10.2.6 Conference Representation. No more than one team from any Division I conference may participate in **a each** preseason exempted football event during an academic year."

**Source:** University of Arizona; Baylor University; Boston College; Florida State University; University of Georgia; University of Michigan; University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Ohio State University; University of Pittsburgh; Southern Methodist University; Texas Christian University; U.S. Naval Academy; and University of Washington.

**Rationale:** This proposal accommodates for the amalgamation of conferences and the possible reduction of the football talent pool in a given year.

**Action:** Referred by Divisions I-A and I-AA to Special Committee to Review Contest Exemptions.

#### NO. 69-5 PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION I

**Intent:** In Division I sports other than football and basketball, to ex-



empt from reimbursement of expense requirements any regular-season tournament or multiple team contests either against or under the sponsorship of an active NCAA member institution located in Alaska and/or Hawaii.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 69-J, 30.10.3.6.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

"30.10.3.6.1 Exception. There shall be an exception to the reimbursement of expense requirements listed above for any non-tournament, regular-season event in Alaska and/or Hawaii **and for any regular-season tournament or multiple-team contests (e.g., invitational meets) either against or under the sponsorship of an active NCAA member institution located in Alaska and/or Hawaii.**"

**Source:** Brigham Young University; Colorado State University; University of Hawaii, Manoa; San Diego State University; San Jose State University; University of Texas, El Paso; U.S. Air Force Academy; Utah State University; and University of Wyoming.

**Rationale:** NCAA member institutions in Alaska and Hawaii use contest exemptions to meet NCAA scheduling requirements. It is impossible for nonrevenue sports to meet these expense requirements. Denying nonrevenue athletes an opportunity to visit Hawaii or Alaska and denying the athletes in those states competitive opportunities at home is discriminatory and unfair.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 70 (NO. 2-86) **PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — WEEKLY HOUR LIMITATIONS OUT OF SEASON**

**Intent:** In Division I, to include a student-athlete's participation in activities under the safety exception in the weekly hour limitations outside of the playing season and to eliminate the requirement that only two of the eight hours permitted out of season may be spent on individual skill workouts.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.02.1.2.1, page 231, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.02.1.2.1 Divisions I and II Safety Exception. A coach may be present during voluntary individual workouts in the institution's regular practice facility (without the workouts being considered as countable athletically related activities, **provided they occur, in Division I, within the playing season**) in the following situations, and the coach may spot or provide safety or skill instruction but cannot conduct the individual's workouts: [17.02.1.2.1-(a) through 17.02.1.2.1-(h) unchanged.]

**"17.02.1.2.1.1 Division I — Out of Season. A student-athlete's participation in the voluntary workouts specified in 17.02.1.2.1 outside of the playing season must**

**be counted in the weekly hour limitations set forth in 17.1.5.2."**

[Remainder of 17.02.1.2.1 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.5.2, page 235, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.1.5.2 Weekly Hour Limitations — Outside of Playing Season. Outside of the playing season, only a student-athlete's participation in the countable athletically related activities specified in 17.02.1.1-(c), 17.02.1.1-(d) *and*, 17.02.1.1-(e) **and, in Division I, 17.02.1.2** shall be permitted. A student-athlete's participation in such activities shall be limited to a maximum of eight hours per week, of which not more than two hours per week may be spent on individual skill workouts set forth in 17.02.1.1-(e) and 17.1.5.2.1."

**Source:** All members of the Big Ten Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The adoption of voluntary out-of-season skill instruction legislation now allows student-athletes in sports other than football to receive coaching in the off-season up to two hours a week. However, for those sports with the safety exception, there are no time limits on voluntary workouts that occur in season or out of season, adding to concerns that the safety exception has become the means by which unlimited, year-round practice is occurring. This proposal would (a) establish an eight-hour-per-week time limit for the specified permissible activities that occur during the off-season (unlimited number of hours for safety-exception activities in season would remain); and (b) allow student-athletes to have a choice in determining in which specified out-of-season activities they wish to participate within a maximum of eight hours per week. Under this proposal, a student-athlete can have eight hours per week of skill instruction during the off-season if he or she wishes to do so.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 71 (NO. 2-87) **PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVISIONS I AND II TENNIS**

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II, to permit an institution that conducts its traditional segment in the sport of tennis during the fall to commence practice sessions August 24 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever occurs first; further, to permit such an institution to engage in its first date of competition in the sport of tennis September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.10 by adding new 17.1.10.4, page 238,



renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

**"17.1.10.4 Conducting More Than 50 Percent of Schedule in Tennis During Nontraditional Segment — Divisions I and II. A member institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall and that schedules more than 50 percent of its contests or dates of competition (including the conference championship) in the nontraditional segment may elect to utilize the preseason practice and first-date-of-competition regulations applicable to the traditional segment as set forth in 17.17.2 and 17.17.3."**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.17.2, page 310, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

**"17.17.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in tennis prior to the following dates:**

**"17.17.2.1 Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.**

**"17.17.2.1.1 Exception — Divisions I and II. A Division I or II institution that conducts its traditional segment during the fall per 17.1.10.4 may commence practice August 24 or the first date on which classes are scheduled for the institution's fall term, whichever date occurs first."**

[17.17.2.1.1 renumbered as 17.17.2.1.2, unchanged.]

[Remainder of 17.17.2 unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.17.3.1, page 310, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

**"17.17.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (meet or practice meets) with outside competition in the sport of tennis prior to the following dates:**

**"17.17.3.1 Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.**

**"17.17.3.1.1 Exception — Divisions I and II. A Division I or II institution that conducts its traditional segment during the fall per 17.1.10.4 may play its first contest with outside competition September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday, except that exhibition scrimmages may be conducted during the preseason practice period (see 17.17.2)."**

[17.17.3.1.1 renumbered as 17.17.3.1.2, unchanged.]

[Remainder of 17.17.3 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** When the membership voted in January 1995 to have the first day of practice for the nontraditional segment to be September 7 or the first day of classes, whichever is earlier, there was no consideration for those institutions that conduct the traditional segment during the fall. Division III allows that exception. To include Divisions I and II in the exception would allow adequate practice time before competition begins. Further, because of weather problems, in some areas of the country it is more advantageous to conduct the traditional segment in the fall. An earlier start to the season will allow schedules to be completed before inclement weather sets in.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I and II.

**NO. 72 (NO. 2-88) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVISIONS I AND II TENNIS**

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II, to permit an institution that conducts its traditional segment in the sport of tennis during the fall to conduct 10 practice opportunities prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate contest.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.1.10 by adding new 17.1.10.4, page 238, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

**"17.1.10.4 Conducting More Than 50 Percent of Schedule in Tennis During Nontraditional Segment — Divisions I and II. A member institution that conducts its nontraditional tennis segment in the fall and that schedules more than 50 percent of its contests or dates of competition (including the conference championship) in the nontraditional segment may elect to use the preseason practice regulations applicable to the traditional segment as set forth in 17.17.2."**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.17.2, page 310, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

**"17.17.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in tennis prior to the following dates:**

**"17.17.2.1 Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.**

**"17.17.2.1.1 Exception — Divisions I and II. A Division I or II institution that conducts its traditional segment during the fall per 17.1.10.4 may commence practice on the date that permits a maximum of 10 practice opportunities (see 17.02.13) prior to its first scheduled intercollegiate**



contest.”

[17.7.2.1.1 renumbered as 17.7.2.1.2, unchanged.]

[Remainder of 17.17.2 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The current legislation, adopted at the 1995 NCAA Convention, does not provide an opportunity for Divisions I and II institutions that conduct their traditional segment in tennis during the fall to commence practice sessions prior to September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier. This does not provide a sufficient opportunity for student-athletes to adequately prepare for the first scheduled contest. This proposal will allow those institutions 10 practice opportunities prior to the first scheduled contest.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Moot in Divisions I and II.

**NO. 73 (NO. 2-89) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — ANNUAL EXEMPTIONS — BASEBALL, FIELD HOCKEY, LACROSSE, SOCCER AND SOFTBALL**

**Intent:** In the sports of baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer and softball, to permit institutions to exempt annually participation in one season-ending tournament from the maximum number of contests/dates of competition.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.2.5.3, pages 243-245, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“17.2.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of baseball contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-4):

[17.2.5.3-(a) and 17.2.5.3-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) *NAIA Championship Season-Ending Tournament.* Competition in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) baseball championship; **one season-ending baseball tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship).** A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season;

[17.2.5.3-(d) unchanged.]

“(e) *NCAA Championship.* Competition in an NCAA baseball championship;”

[17.2.5.3-(f) through 17.2.5.3-(n) relettered as 17.2.5.3-(e) through 17.2.5.3-(m), unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.6.5.3, pages 261-263, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“17.6.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of contests or dates of competition in the sport of field hockey shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-8):

[17.6.5.3-(a) and 17.6.5.3-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) *NCAA Championship Season-Ending Tournament.* Competition in an NCAA field hockey championship **one season-ending field hockey tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship).** A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season;”

[Remainder of 17.6.5.3 unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.11.5.2, page 286, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“17.11.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of lacrosse shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-14):

[17.11.5.2-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *NCAA Championship Season-Ending Tournament.* Competition in an NCAA lacrosse championship **one season-ending lacrosse tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship).** A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season;”

[Remainder of 17.11.5.2 unchanged.]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 17.14.5.2, pages 296-298, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“17.14.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of soccer contests and dates of competition shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-17):

[17.14.5.2-(a) and 17.14.5.2-(b) unchanged.]

“(c) *NAIA Championship Season-Ending Tournament.* Competition in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) soccer championship **one season-ending soccer tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship).** A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season;

“(d) *NCAA Championship.* Competition in an NCAA soccer championship;”

[17.14.5.2-(e) through 17.14.5.2-(n) relettered as 17.14.5.2-(d) through 17.14.5.2-(m), unchanged.]

**E. Bylaws:** Amend 17.15.5.3, pages 301-303, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“17.15.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of softball contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-18):



[17.15.5.3-(a) and 17.15.5.3-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) *NAIA Championship Season-Ending Tournament.* Competition in the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) softball championship **one season-ending softball tournament (e.g., NCAA championship, NAIA championship).** A season-ending tournament involves competition after the end of the regular season between teams that are not identified until the close of that regular season;

"(d) *NCAA Championship. Competition in an NCAA softball championship.*"

[17.15.5.3-(e) through 17.15.5.3-(o) relettered as 17.15.5.3-(d) through 17.15.5.3-(n), unchanged.]

**Source:** Adelphi University, Fairfield University, College of the Holy Cross, Merrimack College, Pace University, Plymouth State College, Tufts University and U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal simplifies and makes consistent the annual exemption legislation by providing postseason opportunities in baseball, field hockey, lacrosse, soccer and softball similar to those now offered in basketball, football and volleyball.

**Committee Position (Special Committee to Review Contest Exemptions):** If the legislation related to certification of certain exempted events sponsored by the Council is adopted, the special committee recommends that this proposal be referred to the Special Events Committee so that it may review each event and determine whether it meets the new criteria for certification. The special committee took no position on this proposal if the legislation sponsored by the Council is defeated.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I. Adopted by Divisions II and III.

#### NO. 74 (NO. 2-91) **PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — FIRST CONTEST DATE — DIVISION I BASKETBALL**

**Intent:** To specify that the first contest date in Division I basketball for the 1996-97, 1997-98 and 1998-99 seasons shall be November 22, November 21 and November 20, respectively.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.3, page 247, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.3 First Contest. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in basketball prior to the following dates, except as provided under 17.3.3.1:

"(a) Division I — **November 22 for the 1996-97 academic year, November 21 for the 1997-98 academic year, November 20 for the 1998-99 academic year and the Friday immediately following Thanksgiving for the 1999-2000 academic year and thereafter.**"

[Remainder of 17.3.3 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Atlantic 10 and Big East Conferences.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The dates of the Final Four change from year to year, and in some years the Thanksgiving holiday falls in the last week of November. When these events occur in the same year, the number of playing dates are reduced by as much as a week, which causes scheduling problems and additional missed class time for student-athletes. Moving the starting date up one week for the 1996-97, 1997-98 and the 1998-99 playing seasons will alleviate the scheduling and missed class time problems associated with fewer playing dates.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 75 (NO. 2-92) **FIRST CONTEST DATE AND CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — DIVISION II BASKETBALL**

**Intent:** In the sport of Division II basketball, to exempt annually participation in the Division II Tip-Off Classic from counting against an institution's maximum number of contests, and to specify that participation in the Classic may take place after November 1.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.3.1, pages 247-248, as follows:  
[Division II only]

"17.3.3.1 Exceptions. The following basketball contests (games or scrimmages) are permitted prior to the first contest dates specified under 17.3.3:

[17.3.3.1-(a) and 17.3.3.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Martin Luther King Classic, Tip-Off Classic, Foreign Team in Canada, Great Alaska Shootout, Maui Invitational. The following basketball games may be played after November 15 by a Division I institution and after November 1 by a Division II or III institution:

[17.3.3.1-(c)-(1) and 17.3.3.1-(c)-(2) unchanged.]

"(3) **For Division II members only, games in the Division II Tip-Off Classic;**"

[17.3.3.1-(c)-(3) through 17.3.3.1-(c)-(5) renumbered as 17.3.3.1-(c)-(4) through 17.3.3.1-(c)-(6), unchanged.]

[Remainder of 17.3.3.1 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.5.2, pages 248-249, as follows:  
[Division II only]

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:

[17.3.5.2-(a) through 17.3.5.2-(g) unchanged.]



**“(h) Division II Tip-Off Classic. For Division II only, games in the Division II Tip-Off Classic;”**

[17.3.5.2-(h) and 17.3.5.2-(i) relettered as 17.3.5.2-(i) and 17.3.5.2-(j), unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.5.3.5, pages 250-251, as follows:

[Division II only]

“17.3.5.3.5 Additional Division II Options. Not more than once every four years, a Division II member institution may exempt not more than one of the following from counting toward the maximum number of basketball contests:

[17.3.5.3.5-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) *Tip-Off Classic. The Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic game;*”

[17.3.5.3.5-(c) relettered as 17.3.5.3.5-(b), unchanged.]

**Source:** Augustana College (South Dakota); California State University, Bakersfield; Lewis University; Mankato State University; Morningside College; New Hampshire College; University of South Dakota; South Dakota State University; and Wayne State College (Nebraska).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** In the interest of promoting Division II men's basketball, the proposers seek a similar exemption to that currently afforded Division I institutions. With the need to enhance Division II basketball, this legislation will provide an opportunity to highlight and promote the upcoming Division II basketball season and provide a quality experience for student-athletes in Division II. The goal is to provide representation from each region on a rotation basis so that all areas of the country will benefit. Further, it should be noted that the Classic would be sponsored and would not result in a significant expenditure to the Association and its member institutions. Moreover, it is intended that any revenues from the Classic (after expenses) would be distributed to a nonprofit or charitable organization.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted in Division II.

**NO. 76 (NO. 2-97) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — LACROSSE**

**Intent:** In the sport of lacrosse, to indicate that an institution may exempt annually one date of competition against the U.S. national lacrosse team or one date of competition against a foreign team in the United States..

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.11.5.2, page 286, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“17.11.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates

of competition in the sport of lacrosse shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-14):

[17.11.5.2-(a) through 17.11.5.2-(d) unchanged.]

“(e) Foreign Team in U.S. or United States National Team. One date of competition in lacrosse each year with a foreign opponent in the United States or the United States national team.”

[Remainder of 17.11.5.2 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Ivy Group.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** There are few countries that play lacrosse outside the United States, providing few opportunities for teams to take advantage of the option [17.11.5.2-(e)] for an exempt scrimmage. In addition, it is helpful to the development of the U.S. national team to be able to compete against college teams. This opportunity currently is available in ice hockey and basketball.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee took no position on this proposal but noted that in sports other than basketball and football, a game against the U.S. national team is one of the proposed annual exemptions in the proposal related to contest exemptions being sponsored by the Council.

**Action:** Moot in Division I. Not moved in Division II.

**NO. 77 (NO. 2-102) CONTEST EXEMPTIONS — SOFTBALL**

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II, to permit an institution's softball team to exempt annually one contest played against the U.S. national softball team.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.15.5.3, pages 301-302, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

“17.15.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of softball contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-18):

[17.15.5.3-(a) through 17.15.5.3-(h) unchanged.]

“(i) U.S. National Team. One softball contest each year against the U.S. national softball team;”

[17.15.5.3-(i) through 17.15.5.3-(o) relettered as 17.15.5.3-(j) through 17.15.5.3-(p), unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** To permit an institution's softball team to exempt annually one contest played against the U.S. national softball team is consistent with an exemption that currently exists in ice hockey for the U.S. Olympic team. The Amateur Softball Association has indicated that such competition with an institution's team



will increase the quality of players not only at the national team level but also at the collegiate level. Thus, all participants will receive a lasting benefit.

**Action:** Moot in Division I. Adopted by Division II.

**NO. 78 (NO. 2-94) CONTEST EXEMPTIONS —  
DIVISION I BASKETBALL**

**Intent:** In the sport of Division I basketball, to permit institutions to exempt annually one contest in the Great Eight Basketball Festival from their maximum number of basketball contests.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.3.5.2, pages 248-249, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.3.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of basketball contests each year shall exclude the following:

[17.3.5.2-(a) through 17.3.5.2-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) **Great Eight Basketball Festival. For Division I only, one contest in the Great Eight Basketball Festival.**"

[17.3.5.2-(i) relettered as 17.3.5.2-(j), unchanged.]

**Source:** University of Arizona; University of Georgia; University of Houston; Louisiana State University; University of North Carolina, Asheville; University of Oklahoma; Rice University; Rutgers University, New Brunswick; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; University of Toledo; Villanova University; and Western Carolina University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The Great Eight Basketball Festival consists of four games (double headers on successive nights) between eight participating schools, which are selected according to their finishing position in the NCAA tournament. The festival has been developed to provide recognition and financial support for the CHAMPS/Life Skills Program, a concept that is being developed jointly by the Division I-A Athletic Directors Association and the education services staff at the NCAA national office. The primary goal of the festival is to bring national attention to a program that has as its mission the well-being of the student-athlete. Revenue generated from the festival is being used to conduct CHAMPS/Life Skills administration symposiums and recognition banquets, to produce educational publications, and to provide seed money for schools initiating CHAMPS/Life Skills programs. The education services staff and the Division I-A athletics directors have assisted more than 100 schools since the inception of the program in 1993.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee opposes this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

**NO. 79 (NO. 2-95) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS  
— FIRST CONTEST DATE —  
DIVISIONS I AND II FOOTBALL**

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II football, to change the first permissible contest date to the Thursday preceding Labor Day.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.7.3, pages 266-267, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A, I-AA and II football, divided vote]

"17.7.3 First Contest. In Divisions I and II, a member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football prior to *September 1 (or the preceding Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday or Monday)* **the Thursday preceding Labor Day** except when selected to participate in the National Football Foundation benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game, both sponsored by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics and played in the week prior to the beginning of the regular playing season in football. In Division III, a member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in football prior to the Friday or Saturday 11 weeks before the first round of the NCAA Division III Football Championship."

**Source:** NCAA Council and all members of the Mid-American Athletic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal attempts to address an inconsistency in the first date of competition legislation in the sport of football. This inconsistency resulted in the membership's desire to consider alternatives to the Saturday preceding Labor Day. Under current legislation, the first permissible Saturday of any given season is two days before Labor Day. As a result, many institutions have used the preceding Thursday (when permitted) as a contest date, in lieu of the holiday weekend, to help maximize attendance and revenue. However, a consistent standard does not exist that permits games to be played on the Thursday prior to Labor Day. To illustrate this point, for the 1987 through 2006 seasons, existing legislation permits competition on the Thursday prior to Labor Day nine times, while not permitting it 11 times. This proposal will extend the opportunity for Divisions I and II institutions to open the football season on the Thursday preceding Labor Day every season, regardless of calendar fluctuations.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee took no action on this proposal, inasmuch as during its August meeting, the Council voted to cosponsor the proposal.



**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I-A, I-AA and II.

**NO. 80 (NO. 2-98) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —  
FIRST CONTEST DATE —  
DIVISIONS I AND II SOCCER**

**Intent:** To permit Divisions I and II institutions to begin competition in the sport of soccer during the traditional segment on September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday and to allow an alumni contest to be played the weekend prior to September 1 when September 1 does not fall on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.14.3, page 296, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.14.3 First Contest or Date of Competition. A member institution shall not play its first contest or engage in its first date of competition with outside competition in each segment in soccer prior to the following dates:

"17.14.3.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II — *The first Saturday in September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday, except that an alumni contest may be played the weekend prior to September 1 when September 1 does not fall on a Saturday, Sunday or Monday.*"

[Remainder of 17.14.3 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Big West Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This amendment would make the starting date for competition in the sports of Divisions I and II soccer consistent with that of the sport of women's volleyball. It would allow institutions to participate in soccer competition during the Labor Day weekend when Labor Day falls on either September 1 or 2. At many institutions, Labor Day weekend is a good weekend for hosting a soccer event, in terms of marketing and attendance. In addition, it would allow institutions to play their alumni contest the weekend prior to September 1 when that date does not fall on either Saturday, Sunday or Monday.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I and II.

**NO. 81 (NO. 2-99) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —  
FIRST CONTEST DATE — DIVISIONS I  
AND II SOCCER**

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the

following proposal.]

**Intent:** To permit Divisions I and II institutions to begin competition in the sport of soccer during the traditional segment on September 1 or the preceding Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.14.3, page 296, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.14.3 First Contest or Date of Competition. A member institution shall not play its first contest or engage in its first date of competition in each segment in soccer prior to the following dates:

"17.14.3.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II — *The first Saturday in September 1 (or the preceding Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday).*"

[Remainder of 17.14.3 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, Adelphi University and University of Virginia.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Moving the first date of competition in soccer to include Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday would allow a team to play two weekend games. This would result in less missed class time and save on team travel expenses. This situation would occur only once every six years.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I. Moot in Division II.

**NO. 82 (NO. 2-100) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —  
FIRST CONTEST DATE — DIVISIONS I  
AND II SOCCER**

**Intent:** To permit Divisions I and II institutions to begin competition in the sport of soccer during the traditional segment on the first Saturday in September or the preceding Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.14.3.1, page 296, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.14.3.1 Traditional Segment

"(a) Divisions I and II — *The first Saturday in September (or the preceding Saturday if September 1 falls on a Sunday).*"

[Remainder of 17.14.3.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Big East Conference; University of Massachusetts, Amherst; and University of Vermont.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Moving the starting date in soccer to include Saturday if

Legislative Proposals

A-183



September 1 falls on a Sunday would allow a team to play two weekend games. This would result in less missed class time and save on team travel expenses. This situation would occur only once every six years.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Playing and Practice Seasons):** The subcommittee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Moot in Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 83 (NO. 2-101) CONTEST LIMITATIONS — SOFTBALL TOURNAMENTS — DIVISION III

**Intent:** To define the term "tournament" as it applies to countable contests in Division III softball.

**Bylaws:** Amend 17.15.5.1.2, page 301, as follows:  
[Division III only]

"17.15.5.1.2 Tournament Dates — Division III. In Division III, each date of a softball tournament shall be counted as one contest, provided not more than two tournaments fall under this provision during an academic year. **For purposes of this legislation, a tournament shall be defined as an intercollegiate athletics event in which all of the following conditions are satisfied:**

"(a) The event is a series of consecutive athletics contests that culminate in the designation of one team championship. Teams may advance through a single-elimination, double-elimination or pool-play bracket structure;

"(b) The event is not longer than three days in duration, with a maximum of four contests per team scheduled on any one day. Competition may be held at more than one site; and

"(c) Competing teams are selected (and may be seeded according to athletics ability) in advance of the competition."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division III Steering Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal will establish an official definition of a "tournament" for Division III softball. Currently, institutions must interpret for themselves which softball events qualify as tournaments for purposes of contest limitations. The conditions an event must meet in order for a team to be able to count the dates of a softball tournament as one contest should be clarified legislatively.

**Action:** Defeated by Division III.

#### Championships/Bowl Games

#### NO. 84 (NO. 2-106) NATIONAL COLLEGIATE CHAMPIONSHIP — WOMEN'S CREW

**Intent:** To establish a National Collegiate Women's Crew Championship.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 18.3.1, page 337, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

"18.3.1 National Collegiate Championships (9 10)

"Women (3 4)

"Crew"

[Remainder of 18.3.1 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 21.6 by adding new 21.6.11, page 396, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.11 Crew Committee, Women's. The Women's Crew Committee shall consist of seven members, including four members from Division I, one member from Division II, one member from Division III and one member elected at large. In Division I, one member shall represent District 1, one member shall represent District 2, one member shall represent District 8, and one member shall represent Districts 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7."

**Source:** NCAA Council; University of Arizona; Arizona State University; University of California, Berkeley; University of Oregon; Oregon State University; University of Southern California; Stanford University; University of Washington; and Washington State University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Women's crew has been identified as an emerging sport. Currently, the number of institutions that sponsor the sport of women's crew at the varsity level (74 in 1994-95) exceeds the number of institutions required to establish an NCAA championship. Since the sport provides participation opportunities for large numbers of women, it is probable that the number of member institutions sponsoring the sport will increase. Without an NCAA crew championship, sponsoring institutions are forced to compete in a non-NCAA championship against participants who do not comply with NCAA rules. The creation of an NCAA crew championship would result in a season-ending experience involving institutions abiding by similar policies.

**Committee Position (Executive Committee):** The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Committee Position (Committee on Women's Athletics):** The committee supports this proposal.



**Action:** Adopted.

**NO. 85 (NO. 2-103) CHAMPIONSHIPS CRITERIA —  
MINIMUM SPONSORSHIP  
EXCEPTION**

**Intent:** To permit a National Collegiate Championship or a division championship that has been sponsored for 10 years or longer to continue, regardless of the number of sponsoring institutions.

**Bylaws:** Amend 18.2.3, page 336, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

**"18.2.3 Championships Existing During 1993-94 That Have Been Sponsored For a Period of 10 Years or Longer.** An existing National Collegiate Championship or a division championship that exists during the 1993-94 academic year may be continued if at least 40 member institutions sponsor the sport **that has been sponsored for a period of 10 years or longer shall be continued regardless of the number of institutions sponsoring the sport, unless the membership adopts specific legislation to discontinue that championship."**

[Remainder of 18.2.3 unchanged.]

**Source:** University of California, Berkeley; University of Illinois, Chicago; University of Iowa; James Madison University; University of Massachusetts, Amherst; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Ohio State University; University of Oklahoma; Southern Connecticut State University; San Jose State University; Syracuse University; U.S. Air Force Academy; and U.S. Naval Academy.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** There are sports that have an established tradition of excellence, but that never have fielded large numbers of teams. These sports, when compared with sports that have higher participation rates, offer the same positive opportunities for student-athletes and member institutions. By continuing to offer a varied selection of sports championships, the NCAA provides more student-athletes with opportunities to pursue a degree in higher education while pursuing excellence in their chosen sport. Continuation of all championships that have been sponsored for 10 years or longer, regardless of participation numbers, will allow institutions to continue a tradition for student-athletes, alumni and friends that has existed for a decade or more. It also allows an opportunity for the institution to earn revenue from nonscholarship student-athletes who pay tuition, fees and room and board, and who subsequently may become contributing alumni to the institution.

**Committee Position (Executive Committee):** The committee opposes the proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

**NO. 86 (NO. 2-104) CHAMPIONSHIPS — MORATORIUM**

**Intent:** To extend the moratorium on the discontinuation of any NCAA championship through 1998-99.

**Bylaws:** Amend 18.2.10.1, page 337, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

**"18.2.10.1 National Collegiate and Division Championships Exception.** During the 1994-95, 1995-96, and 1996-97, **1997-98 and 1998-99** academic years, an existing National Collegiate Championship or division championship shall not be canceled, nor shall transportation and per diem expenses be discontinued, due to that championship's failure to meet the minimum numerical sponsorship requirements for maintaining the championship. Upon the expiration of this legislative exception, if during the 1996-97 **1998-99** period a championship fell below the applicable minimum numerical sponsorship requirement set forth in 18.2.3 or 18.2.4, it shall be discontinued automatically."

**Source:** University of California, Berkeley; University of Illinois, Champaign; University of Illinois, Chicago; University of Iowa; James Madison University; University of Massachusetts, Amherst; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Ohio State University; University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University; Southern Connecticut State University; Springfield College; Syracuse University; U.S. Air Force Academy; U.S. Military Academy; U.S. Naval Academy; and College of William and Mary.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** At the 1995 NCAA Convention, legislation was adopted to extend the moratorium on the discontinuation of any women's NCAA championships through 1998-99. In the spirit of equality and gender equity, it is appropriate to extend the moratorium to the discontinuation of any NCAA championship through the same year.

**Committee Position (Executive Committee):** The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted.

**NO. 87 (NO. 2-105) CHAMPIONSHIPS — MINIMUM  
SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA — OLYMPIC  
SPORTS**

**Intent:** To create a protected status to continue all men's and women's NCAA championships in Olympic sports.

**Bylaws:** Amend 18.2.10 by adding new 18.2.10.3, page 337, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

**"18.2.10.3 Exception — Olympic Sports.** National collegiate



or divisional championships in Olympic sports shall be exempt from the minimum-sponsorship-percentage requirements of 18.2.3 and 18.2.4. The membership may adopt specific legislation to discontinue the championship in an Olympic sport."

**Source:** University of California, Berkeley; University of Illinois, Chicago; University of Iowa; James Madison University; University of Massachusetts, Amherst; University of Minnesota, Twin Cities; Ohio State University; University of Oklahoma; Southern Connecticut State University; Springfield College; Syracuse University; U.S. Air Force Academy; U.S. Military Academy; and U.S. Naval Academy.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Having a protected status for NCAA championships in Olympic sports provides the opportunity to promote one of the purposes of the NCAA as stated in its Constitution: "To cooperate with other amateur athletics organizations in promoting and conducting national and international athletics events." Few international amateur events are as visible as the Olympic Games. Student-athletes who compete in the Olympics, World University Games and other international competitions reflect positively on individual member institutions and on the NCAA. It is a tribute to the intercollegiate athletics system in the United States that many Olympians have the opportunity to pursue an education at the same time they are training for international competition.

**Committee Position (Executive Committee):** The committee opposes the proposal.

**Action:** Defeated.

#### NO. 88 (NO. 2-118) NATIONAL COLLEGIATE CHAMPIONSHIPS — SIZE OF FIELD

**Intent:** To establish a moratorium on any reduction in the size of championship fields for all NCAA men's and women's National Collegiate Championships through the 1998-99 academic year.

**Bylaws:** Amend 31.3.1 by adding new 31.3.1.1, page 437, as follows:  
[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

**"31.3.1.1 Exception — Moratorium. During the 1995-96, 1996-97, 1997-98 and 1998-99 academic years, the Executive Committee shall not reduce the size of the championship field in any existing men's or women's National Collegiate Championship."**

**Source:** University of Alaska Anchorage, University of Alaska Fairbanks, Duquesne University, Harvard University, Johnson State College, Middlebury College, Montana State University, Ohio State University, St. John's University (New York), U.S. Naval

Academy, University of Vermont, West Virginia University and Western State College of Colorado.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** Consistent with the vote and rationale of the membership during the 1995 NCAA Convention on issues pertaining to 18.2.10.1 (national collegiate championships exception) and 18.2.10.2 (exception — women's championships existing during 1993-94), no men's or women's National Collegiate Championship should have its championship field reduced prior to a review following this four-year moratorium in order to: (a) allow time to determine whether the championship's quality is determined solely upon the numbers of teams/participants, and (b) allow more time for national governing bodies (e.g., U.S. Olympic Committee) to react to legislation from the 1994 Convention. Also, in keeping with the commitment to achieve gender equity, this legislation allows for an exception to be made for existing championships that include women. As institutions validate their sports sponsorship based on the offering of NCAA championships, a reduction in championship opportunities may have the direct result of some institutions dropping the sport and others failing to add the sport. Efforts currently are underway by national governing bodies to encourage sports sponsorship. Time is needed for this process to work, to maintain the stated goal of increasing student-athlete access, and to not exacerbate the downward spiral of sport sponsorship for existing men's and women's National Collegiate Championship sports that would be started by reductions in these championship fields.

**Committee Position (Executive Committee):** The Committee opposes this proposal.

**Action:** Defeated.

#### NO. 89 (NO. 2-119) NET CHAMPIONSHIP RECEIPTS

**Intent:** To permit the NCAA Executive Committee to apportion and distribute net receipts derived from NCAA championships in emerging sports and sports that are in danger of having less than the minimum number of sponsoring institutions directly to institutions that sponsor those sports.

**Bylaws:** Amend 31.4.7 by adding new 31.4.7.1, page 444, as follows:

[General provision, all divisions, common vote]

**"31.4.7.1 Exception — Emerging Sports and Sports With Limited Sponsorship. The Executive Committee may permit the apportionment and distribution of net receipts derived from championships in emerging sports for women (per 20.02.5) and sports in danger of falling below minimum-sponsorship requirements (per 18.2.3 and 18.2.4) directly to the institutions sponsoring those sports."**



**Source:** Boston College; University of Maine; University of Massachusetts, Amherst; University of Massachusetts at Lowell; Merrimack College; Providence College; Rutgers University, New Brunswick; and Seton Hall University.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** Institutions sponsoring sports that have either not yet established themselves or that are struggling to develop are finding it increasingly difficult to maintain their commitment to these sports due to financial hardships. In order to assist those institutions that are investing resources into these developmental and growing sports and to underscore the growing trend of federating sports, net profits generated from NCAA championships would be retained by those institutions to be reinvested into these programs. Such action would provide institutions the incentive to continue their commitment to these sports, as well as lessen the financial burden that institutions are undertaking by sponsoring such sports.

**Committee Position (Executive Committee):** The committee opposes the proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

#### NO. 90 (NO. 2-116) POSTSEASON BOWL CERTIFICATION — MINIMUM WINS

**Intent:** To permit a Division I-A institution to count one victory against a Division I-AA opponent toward the maximum of six wins necessary to qualify for a postseason bowl game, provided the Division I-AA opponent has awarded an average of at least 60 financial aid equivalencies in football during the preceding three academic years.

**Bylaws:** Amend 30.9.2, page 413, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"30.9.2 Contest Status. A contest shall be certified only if it serves the purpose of providing a national contest between deserving winning teams. Beginning with the 1991-92 academic year, a 'deserving winning team' shall be defined as one that has won a minimum of six games against Division I-A opponents (**except as permitted in 30.9.2.1**) and that has more wins than losses. Tie games do not count in determining a team's won-lost record.

**"30.9.2.1 Exception — Division I-AA Opponent. An institution may count one victory against a Division I-AA opponent toward the six-win minimum, provided the Division I-AA opponent has averaged at least 60 financial aid equivalencies in football during the preceding three academic years."**

[30.9.2.1 renumbered as 30.9.2.2, unchanged.]

**Source:** University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; Clemson University;

Kansas State University; Louisiana State University; Mississippi State University; University of Missouri, Columbia; Oklahoma State University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; U.S. Military Academy; and University of Wyoming.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal reflects the changing face of Division I-A football. Only a limited number of institutions still compete as football independents. Most institutions are aligned with a conference and are required to play a conference schedule that limits nonconference competition and ensures quality wins. Further, current agreements between bowls and conferences limit the number of "at large" berths into bowl games. This proposal will permit Division I-A institutions to continue to compete, on a limited basis, against Division I-AA football programs. It identifies Division I-AA institutions that have made a significant contribution to the sport of football, and will perpetuate traditional rivalries and mutually advantageous revenue opportunities without compromising the philosophy that bowl-game eligibility be based on wins against quality football programs. A number of Division I-AA institutions that have historical ties to Division I-A programs have been placed at a competitive and financial disadvantage by having long-standing games eliminated due to the adoption of the "six-win rule."

**Committee Position (Special Events Committee):** The committee opposes this proposal.

**Action:** Defeated in Division I-A. Motion to reconsider defeated, 44-71-2.

#### NO. 91 RESOLUTION: NCAA DIVISION I WOMEN'S SOCCER CHAMPIONSHIP

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the number of Division I institutions sponsoring women's soccer has increased from 82 in 1990 to 155 in 1995; and

"Whereas, the number of Division I conferences conducting women's soccer championships has increased from four in 1990 to 17 in 1995; and

"Whereas, the NCAA first offered automatic bids in Division I men's soccer in 1986 when 192 institutions were sponsoring the sport; and

"Whereas, in the spirit of gender equity, the men's and women's NCAA soccer championships should be treated equally in terms of access by conference champions;

**"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved,** that the NCAA Executive Committee direct the Division I Women's Soccer Committee to develop a plan for implementing automatic bids and play-ins for the 1997 Division I Women's Soccer Championship, and that this plan be reported



back to the membership at the 1997 NCAA Convention."

**Source:** All members of the Metro Atlantic Athletic, Mid-Continent, and Northeast Conferences.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

### General

#### NO. 92 (NO. 2-111) DIVISION II FOOTBALL — SCHEDULING REQUIREMENT

**Intent:** To permit a Division II institution that sponsors a nonscholarship football program, or that offers fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division II, to appeal to the Division II Steering Committee for a waiver of the Division II football scheduling requirements if fewer than six other similar Division II football programs exist within a 500-mile radius of the institution's campus.

**Bylaws:** Amend 20.10.4.3 by adding new 20.10.4.3.4, page 373, as follows:

[Division II only]

**"20.10.4.3.4 Geographical Waiver — Division II Football.** The Division II Steering Committee, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the provisions of 20.10.4.1 for a Division II institution that does not offer athletically related financial aid in the sport of football, or which offers fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division II football, if it is determined that fewer than six other Division II football programs exist within a 500-mile radius of the institution's campus that do not offer athletically related financial aid in the sport of football or offer fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division II football. An institution shall calculate the applicable percentage based upon the amount of athletically related financial aid received by its student-athletes in the sport of football, as opposed to including all institutional aid in that sport."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division II Steering Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Because of their geographical location, a limited number of Division II institutions find themselves isolated from other Division II limited scholarship and nonscholarship football programs and, therefore, are unable to find a sufficient number of opponents with similar football programs to satisfy the Division II scheduling requirements. This waiver will establish an opportunity for appropriate relief for those institutions and will en-

able them to continue to sponsor their football programs without facing excessive travel and maintenance expenses to secure viable schedules.

**Action:** Adopted by Division II.

#### NO. 93 (NO. 2-112) WOMEN'S SOFTBALL RULES COMMITTEE

**Intent:** To create an NCAA Women's Softball Rules Committee.

**Bylaws:** Amend 21.4 by adding new 21.4.8, page 393, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

**"21.4.8 Softball Rules Committee, Women's.** The Women's Softball Rules Committee shall consist of nine members and shall be constituted as follows:

**"(a) Four members shall be from Division I, two members shall be from Division II, two members shall be from Division III and an additional member shall be secretary-rules editor; and**

**"(b) One member shall be elected chair."**

**Source:** NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** This legislation will permit a Women's Softball Rules Committee to be formed in order to serve the needs of the membership more effectively.

**Action:** Adopted (with immediate effective date).

#### NO. 94 (NO. 2-113) DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL COMMITTEE

**Intent:** To increase the size of the NCAA Division I-AA Football Committee from four to eight members and to revise the representation on the committee from one member from each Division I-AA football region to one member from each Division I-AA conference with automatic qualification status.

**Bylaws:** Amend 21.6.13, page 396, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

**"21.6.13 Football Committee, Division I-AA.** The Division I-AA Football Committee shall consist of *four* **eight** members, including one elected *from* **by** each of the *six* **six** Division I-AA football *region* **conferences with automatic qualification status, and two elected at large.** In the event that there are fewer than *four regions* **six conferences with automatic qualification status,** the additional member(s) shall be elected at large."

**Source:** All members of the Ivy Group and the Southern Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This legislation will permit the Division I-AA Football Committee to fulfill its responsibilities more effectively and will



provide greater representation for the membership.

**Committee Position (Executive Committee):** The committee opposes the proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn.

**NO. 95 (NO. 2-114) DIVISION I-AA FOOTBALL COMMITTEE**

**Intent:** To increase the size of the NCAA Division I-AA Football Committee from four to eight members.

**Bylaws:** Amend 21.6.13, page 396, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.13 Football Committee, Division I-AA. The Division I-AA Football Committee shall consist of *four* **eight** members, including one elected from each Division I-AA football region. In the event that there are fewer than four regions, the additional member(s) shall be elected at large."

**Source:** All members of the Ivy Group and the Southern Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This legislation will permit the Division I-AA Football Committee to fulfill its responsibilities more effectively and will provide greater representation for the membership.

**Committee Position (Executive Committee):** The committee supports the proposal.

**Action:** Adopted.

**NO. 96 (NO. 2-115) DIVISION II WOMEN'S SOFTBALL COMMITTEE**

**Intent:** To increase the size of the NCAA Division II Women's Softball Committee from six to eight members.

**Bylaws:** Amend 21.6.25, page 397, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.6.25 Softball Committee, Division II Women's. The Division II Women's Softball Committee shall consist of *six* **eight** members."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Executive Committee).

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** This legislation will permit the Division II Women's Softball Committee to fulfill its responsibilities more effectively and to provide more representation for the membership.

**Action:** Adopted (with immediate effective date).

**Personnel**

**NO. 97 NO. (2-12) PERSONNEL — GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACH — DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL**

**Intent:** To permit a graduate assistant coach in Division I-A football to make telephone calls to prospective student-athletes.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 11.02.4, pages 52-53, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"11.02.4 Coach, Graduate Assistant. A graduate assistant coach is any coach who has received a baccalaureate degree and is a graduate student enrolled in at least 50 percent of the institution's minimum regular graduate program of studies and qualifies for appointment as a graduate assistant under the policies of the institution. The individual is not required to be enrolled in a specific graduate degree program unless required by institutional policy. The following provisions shall apply:

[11.02.4-(a) through 11.02.4-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) The individual may not evaluate or contact prospective student-athletes off-campus, regardless of whether compensation is received for such activities. **It is permissible for a graduate assistant coach to make telephone calls to prospective student-athletes, provided the coach has successfully completed the coaches certification examination per 11.5.1.1.**"

[Remainder of 11.02.4 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 11.7.2.3, page 62, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

"11.7.2.3 Football Recruiting Coordination Functions. In Division I-A football, all football recruiting coordination functions (except routine clerical tasks) must be performed by the head coach or one or more of the full-time assistant coaches. Such functions include:

"(a) Activities involving athletics evaluation and/or selection of prospects.

"(b) Telephone calls to prospects (or prospects' parents or legal guardians or the prospects' high-school coach).

"(c) Preparation of general recruiting correspondence to prospects (or prospects' parents or legal guardians)."

"11.7.2.3.1 Graduate-Assistant Coach Exception. A graduate assistant coach may perform the functions set forth in 11.7.2.3-(a) and 11.7.2.3-(b) but not those functions set forth in 11.7.2.3-(b) and (c)."

[Remainder of 11.7.2.3 unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.3.4.1, page 91, as follows:



[Division I-A football only]

"13.1.3.4.1 Institutional Staff Members. In all sports, institutional staff members may make telephone calls to a prospect (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) in accordance with the provisions of this bylaw. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, all telephone calls to prospects (or the prospect's parents or legal guardians) must be made by the head coach or one or more of the full-time assistant coaches. **In Division I-A football, such telephone calls also may be made by the graduate assistant coach, provided the coach has successfully completed the coaches certification examination per 11.5.1.1.** In addition, restricted earnings coaches, which, in the sport of football, are permissible only in Division I-AA and at the national service academies in Division I-A, may make such telephone calls."

**Source:** NCAA Council; Boston College; University of Louisville; University of Southern Mississippi; University of Oklahoma; Oklahoma State University; University of Pittsburgh; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; Texas Christian University; U.S. Naval Academy; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; West Virginia University; and University of Wyoming.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Recognizing the importance of recruiting in the professional development of coaching football at the intercollegiate level, graduate assistant football coaches should be allowed to interact via the telephone with prospective student-athletes. Telephone calls made by a graduate assistant would be subject to the current legislation regarding the permissible number of telephone calls and the time period during which such calls can be made. Graduate assistant coaches also would have to pass the coaches certification examination. Graduate assistants still would not be allowed to recruit off campus.

**Committee Position (Council Subcommittee on Personnel Limitations):** The subcommittee voted to support this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I-A.

**NO. 98 NO. (2-13) PERSONNEL — GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACH — DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL**

**Intent:** To permit an institution to employ an additional graduate assistant coach in Division I-A football, provided at least two of the three graduate assistant coaches are ethnic minorities.

**Bylaws:** Amend 11.7.2.1 by adding new 11.7.2.1.4, page 61, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

**"11.7.2.1.4 Additional Graduate Assistant Coach — Ethnic Minority. An institution may employ an additional graduate assistant coach, provided at least two of the three graduate assistant coaches are ethnic minorities."**

**Source:** Boston College; University of Houston; Kansas State University; University of Louisville; University of Oklahoma; University of Southern Mississippi; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; and Texas Tech University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This permissive legislation will encourage and provide additional coaching opportunities for ethnic minorities in Division I-A football. The dearth of ethnic minority football coaches at the college level requires attention to actively develop a pool of minority coaches emanating from the graduate-assistant coaching ranks. A vast majority of existing college football coaches enter the field through the experience gained as a graduate assistant. However, existing legislation related to the graduate assistant position provides limited opportunities for young coaches of any ethnicity to learn the profession of college coaching through the graduate assistant experience, and fierce competition exists among qualified applicants. This proposal will target the growth of ethnic minorities in coaching football at the intercollegiate level.

**Committee Position (Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee):** The committee supports this proposal, unamended.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I-A.

**NO. 98-1 PERSONNEL — GRADUATE ASSISTANT COACH — DIVISION I-A FOOTBALL**

**Intent:** To permit an institution to employ an additional graduate assistant coach in Division I-A football, provided at least one of the three graduate assistant coaches is an ethnic minority.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 98, 11.7.2.1.4, as follows:

[Division I-A football only]

**"11.7.2.1.4 Additional Graduate Assistant Coach — Ethnic Minority. An institution may employ an additional graduate assistant coach, provided at least two **one** of the three graduate assistant coaches **are is an ethnic minorities minority.**"**

**Source:** University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Georgia; University of Houston; Kansas State University; University of Oklahoma; University of Southern Mississippi; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; and Texas Tech University.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I-A.



**NO. 99 (NO. 2-15) COACHING LIMITATIONS AND  
PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS —  
EMERGING SPORTS FOR WOMEN**

**Intent:** To establish coaching limitations in Division I women's archery, badminton, bowling, crew, ice hockey, squash, synchronized swimming, team handball and water polo and to establish maximum contest limitations and playing and practice seasons in all divisions in those sports.

[Note: The following proposal is presented in a nontraditional format.]

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 11.7.4, pages 63-64, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.4 Division I Sports Other Than Football — Limitations on Number. There shall be a limit on the number of coaches that may be employed by an institution in each sport (other than football) as follows:

"Sport	Head or Assistant Coach	Restricted- Earnings Coach
"Archery	2	0
"Badminton	2	0
"Bowling	2	0
"Crew	3	0
"Ice Hockey, Women	2	0
"Squash	2	0
"Synchronized Swimming	2	0
"Team Handball	2	0
"Water Polo, Women	2	0"

[Remainder of 11.7.4 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 11.7.5.1, page 65, as follows:

[Division I only]

"11.7.5.1 Contact and Evaluation of Prospects Off Campus. There is a limit on the number of institutional coaching staff members who may contact or evaluate prospects off campus at any one time, as follows:

"Sport	Limit
"Archery	2
"Badminton	2
"Bowling	2
"Crew	2 (during the academic year)
	3 (during the summer)
"Ice Hockey, Women	2
"Squash	2
"Synchronized Swimming	2
"Team Handball	2
"Water Polo, Women	2"

[Remainder of 11.7.5.1 unchanged.]

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.02.1.2.1, page 231, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"17.02.1.2.1 Divisions I and II Safety Exception. A coach may be present during voluntary individual workouts in the institution's regular practice facility (without the workouts being considered as countable athletically related activities) in the following situations, and the coach may spot or provide safety or skill instruction but cannot conduct the individual's workouts:

"(a) Archery — When the student-athlete uses archery equipment;

"(b) Crew — When the student-athlete uses rowing equipment;

[17.02.1.2.1-(a) through 17.02.1.2.1-(e) relettered as 17.02.1.2.1-(c) through 17.02.1.2.1-(g), unchanged.]

"(h) Synchronized swimming — When the student-athlete is engaged in synchronized swimming;"

[17.02.1.2.1-(f) through 17.02.1.2.1-(h) relettered as 17.02.1.2.1-(i) through 17.02.1.2.1-(k), unchanged.]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 17 by adding new 17.2 (archery), 17.3 (badminton) and 17.15 (squash), pages 242-333, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"17. Archery, Badminton, Bowling and Squash. Regulations for computing the archery, badminton, bowling and squash playing seasons are set forth in 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. (Also see Figures 17-1, 17-2 and 17-3.)

"17.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) shall be limited to the following:

"(a) Divisions I and II. An institution must select one of the following:

"(1) 24-Week Option. A maximum of 24 weeks.

"(2) 144-Day Traditional-Season Option. A 144-day traditional season, which may consist of two segments (each consisting of consecutive days) and which may exclude only the time between these segments, required off days per 17.1.5.4 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur.

"(3) 144-Day Traditional/Nontraditional Segment Option. A 144 consecutive-day season, which shall be divided into a traditional and nontra-



ditional segment and which may exclude only required off days per 17.1.5.4 and official vacation, holiday and final-examination periods during which no practice or competition shall occur.

"(b) Division III — A maximum of 21 weeks.

"17.\_\_.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions prior to the following dates:

"17.\_\_.2.1 Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.\_\_.2.2 Nontraditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.\_\_.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition prior to the following dates:

"17.\_\_.3.1 Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.\_\_.3.2 Nontraditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.\_\_.4 End of Regular Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (meets and practice meets) in each segment by the following dates:

"17.\_\_.4.1 Traditional Segment — The conclusion of the national governing body championship in the applicable sport.

"17.\_\_.4.2 Nontraditional Segment. The last date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.

"17.\_\_.4.3 144-Day Traditional Season. The conclusion of the national governing body championship in the applicable sport or the last date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution.

"17.\_\_.5 Number of Dates of Competition.

"17.\_\_.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the institution's playing season to the following number of dates of competition (games and scrimmages), except for those dates of competition excluded

under 17.\_\_.5.3;

"(a) Archery 15

"(b) Badminton 15 (including not more than three tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition)

"(c) Bowling 26 (including not more than 10 tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition)

"(d) Squash 15 (including not more than three tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition)

"17.\_\_.5.1.1 In-Season Foreign Competition. A member institution may engage in one or more of its countable dates of competition in one or more foreign countries on one trip during the prescribed playing season. However, except for competition in Canada and Mexico or on a certified foreign tour (see 17.23), the institution may not engage in such in-season foreign competition more than once every four years.

"17.\_\_.5.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of dates of competition (this limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

"(a) Archery 15

"(b) Badminton 15 (including not more than three tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition)

"(c) Bowling 26 (including not more than 10 tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition)

"(d) Squash 15 (including not more than three tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition)

"17.\_\_.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sports of archery, badminton, bowling and squash shall exclude the following:



- “(a) Archery — United States Intercollegiate Championships. Competition in the U.S. Intercollegiate Archery Championships.
- “(b) Archery — United States Indoor Championships. Competition in the U.S. Indoor Archery Championships.
- “(c) Conference Championship. Competition in one conference championship meet in the applicable sport.
- “(d) National Governing Body Championship. Competition in the applicable national governing body championship.
- “(e) Alumni Meet. One date of competition each year with an alumni team of the institution;
- “(f) Foreign Team in U.S. One date of competition each year with a foreign opponent in the United States.
- “(g) Certified Foreign Tour. The dates of competition on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a four-year period and is certified by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (see 17.23);
- “(h) Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico. Any dates of competition in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, by a member located outside the area in question;
- “(i) National Championships and International Competition. Competition in national championships; Olympic, Pan American and World University Games qualifying competition in the applicable sport, provided the student-athlete(s) is not representing the member institution in the competition and receives no more than actual and necessary expenses (including entry fees) from the member institution;
- “(j) Fund-Raising Activity. Any activities in which student-athletes from more than one of the institution's athletics teams participate with and against alumni and friends of the institution, the purpose of which is to raise funds for the benefit of the institution's athletics or other programs, provided the student-athletes do not miss classes as a result of their participation; and

“(k) Celebrity Sports Activity. Competition involving a limit of two student-athletes from a member institution's team who participate in local celebrity activities in the applicable sport conducted for the purpose of raising funds for charitable organizations, provided:

- “(1) The student-athletes do not miss classes as a result of the participation;
- “(2) The involvement of the student-athletes has the approval of the institution's athletics director; and
- “(3) The activity takes place within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus.

“17.\_\_.6 Out-of-Season Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the institution's declared playing season pursuant to 17.2.1.

“17.\_\_.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Council. In Divisions I and II, a coach may participate in individual workout sessions with a student-athlete from the coach's team during the summer, provided the request for such assistance is initiated by the student-athlete.

“17.\_\_.7 Camps and Clinics. There are no limits on the number of student-athletes who may be employed (e.g., as counselors) in camps or clinics (also see 13.13). Currently enrolled student-athletes may not participate as campers in their institution's camps or clinics.

“17.\_\_.8 Other Restrictions.

“17.\_\_.8.1 Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition.

“17.\_\_.8.1.1 Division I — During Academic Year. In Division I, a student-athlete who participates during the academic year as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., team invitational meet, exhibition meets or other activity) except while representing the institution in intercollegiate competition shall be ineligible for intercollegiate competition for the remainder of the year and for the next academic year (see 14.7.5 and 14.7.6 for exceptions



and waivers).

"17.\_\_8.1.1.1 Division I Vacation-Period Exception. A Division I student-athlete may compete outside of the institution's declared playing and practice season as a member of an outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition during any official vacation period published in the institution's catalog.

"17.\_\_8.1.2 Divisions II and III — In Season. A Division II or III student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition for the remainder of the season if, following enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is member of an intercollegiate squad or team, she competes or has competed as a member of an outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., team invitational meet, exhibition meets or other activity) during the institution's intercollegiate season (see 14.7.5 and 14.7.6 for exceptions and waivers).

"17.\_\_8.1.3 Waivers/Exceptions. A student-athlete may compete on an outside team in the following circumstances during the institution's academic year in Division I and during the intercollegiate season in Divisions II and III without jeopardizing his or her eligibility;

"(a) The official Olympic Games and the final tryouts therefor;

"(b) Tryouts and competition approved per 14.7.6; and

"(c) One game per year involving players from the student-athlete's former high school and its alumni team, provided such competition takes place during an official vacation period of the institution's academic year.

"17.\_\_8.1.4 Out of Season. A member institution may permit not more than the following number of student-athletes from the same member institution with eligibility remaining to practice or compete out of season on an outside amateur team:

"(a) Division I — No limitations (competition on an outside team permitted only during the summer, except as provided in 17.\_\_8.1.1.1).

"(b) Divisions II and III — No limitations.

"17.\_\_8.1.4.1 Involvement of Coaching Staff Member — Divisions I and II. No member of the coaching staff of a Division I or II member institution may be involved in any capacity (e.g., coach, official, player or league/team administrator) during the academic year (including vacation periods during the academic year) with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with eligibility remaining from the institution's team except as provided under 14.7.6 and 17.23.

"17.\_\_8.1.4.2 Involvement of Coaching Staff Member — Division III. No member of the coaching staff of a Division III member institution may be involved in any capacity (e.g., coach, official, player or league/team administrator) at any time (i.e., during the academic year, vacation periods and summer) with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with eligibility remaining from the institution's team except as provided under 14.7.6 and 17.23.

"17.\_\_8.2 Medical Exams. Medical exams may be administered at any time to enrolled team members or to prospective team members who have signed the National Letter of Intent with the involved institution or who have been accepted for enrollment in a regular, full-time program of studies at that institution, provided the prospects visit the institution at their own expense for this purpose.

"17.\_\_8.3 Equipment Issue, Squad Pictures

"17.\_\_8.3.1 Divisions I and II. No limitations.

"17.\_\_8.3.2 Division III. It shall be permissible to designate a single date for issuing equipment and for taking squad pictures following the beginning of classes in the fall term or the day prior to the beginning of the traditional or nontraditional segment as specified in 17.2.2.

"17.\_\_8.3.2.1 Exception for Sundays. If the day prior to the beginning of a traditional or nontraditional segment is a Sunday, the member institution may designate the preceding Saturday for issuing equipment and taking squad pictures.

"17.\_\_9 Waivers for Extraordinary Personnel Losses.



The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve waivers to the length of the playing season (17.4.1) by modifying the start of preseason practice (17.4.2) for an institution in Division III that has suffered extraordinary personnel losses to its team due to accident or illness of a disastrous nature."

- E. Bylaws: Amend 17 by adding new 17.4, pages 242-333, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

#### "17.4 CREW

"Regulations for computing the crew playing season are set forth in 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations.

"17.4.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) in crew shall be limited to the following:

"(a) All divisions — 26 weeks

"17.4.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions in crew prior to the following dates:

"17.4.2.1 Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.4.2.2 Nontraditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.4.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in crew prior to the following dates:

"17.4.3.1 Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.4.3.2 Nontraditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.4.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in each segment in the sport of crew by the following dates:

"(a) Traditional Segment — The conclusion of the United States Rowing Association championship; and

"(b) Nontraditional Segment — The last date of final exams for the regular academic year at the institution.

#### "17.4.5 Number of Dates of Competition

"17.4.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of crew during the institution's playing season to 20 dates of competition (games and scrimmages), except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.4.5.3:

"17.4.5.1.1 In-Season Foreign Competition. A member institution may engage in one or more of its countable dates of competition in crew in one or more foreign countries on one trip during the prescribed playing season. However, except for competition in Canada and Mexico or on a certified foreign tour (see 17.23), the institution may not engage in such in-season foreign competition more than once every four years.

"17.4.5.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in 20 dates of competition (this limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

"17.4.5.3 Annual Crew Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of crew shall exclude the following:

"(a) Conference Championship. Competition in one conference championship meet in crew;

"(b) United States Rowing Association Championship. Competition in the U.S. Rowing Association championship.

"(c) Alumni Meet. One date of competition in crew each year with an alumni team of the institution;

"(d) Foreign Team in U.S. One date of competition in crew each year with a foreign opponent in the United States;

"(e) Certified Foreign Tour. The dates of competition in crew on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a four-year period and is certified by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (see 17.23);

"(f) Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico. Any dates of competition in crew in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, either against or



under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, by a member located outside the area in question;

“(g) National Championships and International Competition. Crew competition in national championships; Olympic, Pan American and World University Games qualifying competition, provided the student-athlete(s) is not representing the member institution in the competition and receives no more than actual and necessary expenses (including entry fees) from the member institution;

“(h) Fund-Raising Activity. Any crew activities in which student-athletes from more than one of the institution’s athletics teams participate with and against alumni and friends of the institution, the purpose of which is to raise funds for the benefit of the institution’s athletics or other programs, provided the student-athletes do not miss classes as a result of their participation; and

“(i) Celebrity Sports Activity. Competition involving a limit of two student-athletes from a member institution’s crew team who participate in local celebrity crew activities conducted for the purpose of raising funds for charitable organizations, provided:

“(1) The student-athletes do not miss classes as a result of the participation;

“(2) The involvement of the student-athletes has the approval of the institution’s athletics director; and

“(3) The activity takes place within a 30-mile radius of the institution’s main campus.

“17.4.6 Out-of-Season Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the institution’s declared playing season per 17.7.1.

“17.4.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Council.

“17.4.7 Camps and Clinics. There are no limits on the number of student-athletes in crew who may be employed (e.g., as counselors) in camps or clinics (also

see 13.13). Currently enrolled student-athletes may not participate as campers in their institution’s camps or clinics.

#### “17.4.8 Other Restrictions

##### “17.4.8.1 Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition

“17.4.8.1.1 Division I — During the Academic Year. In Division I, a student-athlete in the sport of crew who participates during the academic year as a member of any outside crew team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) except while representing the institution in intercollegiate crew competition shall be ineligible for intercollegiate crew competition for the remainder of the year and for the next academic year (see 14.7.5 and 14.7.6 for exceptions and waivers).

“17.4.8.1.1.1 Division I Vacation-Period Exception. A Division I student-athlete may compete outside of the institution’s declared playing and practice season as a member of an outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition during any official vacation period published in the institution’s catalog.

“17.4.8.1.2 Divisions II and III — In Season. A Division II or III student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate crew competition for the remainder of the season if, following enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate crew squad or team, she competes or has competed as a member of any outside crew team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., tournament play, exhibition games or other activity) during the institution’s intercollegiate crew season (see 14.7.5 and 14.7.6 for exceptions and waivers).

“17.4.8.1.3 Waivers/Exceptions. A student-athlete may compete on an outside team in the following circumstances during the academic year in Division I and during the institution’s intercollegiate season in Divisions II and III without jeopardizing his or her eligibility:

“(a) The official Olympic Games and the final tryouts therefor;

“(b) Tryouts and competition approved per 14.7.6; and



"(c) One game per year involving players from the student-athlete's former high school and its alumni team, provided such competition takes place during an official vacation period of the institution's academic year.

"17.4.8.1.4 Out of Season. A member institution may permit not more than the following number of student-athletes with eligibility remaining in intercollegiate crew to practice or compete out of season on an outside, amateur crew team;

"(a) Division I — No limitations (competition on an outside team permitted only during the summer, except as provided in 17.4.8.1.1.).

"(b) Divisions II and III — No limitations.

"17.4.8.1.4.1 Involvement of Coaching Staff. No member of the coaching staff of a Division I, II or III member institution may be involved in any capacity (e.g., coach, official, player or league/team administrator) at any time (i.e., during the academic year, vacation periods and summer) with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with remaining eligibility from that institution's crew team except as provided under 14.7.6, 17.23 and 30.13.3.1.

"17.4.8.2 Medical Exams. Medical exams may be administered at any time to enrolled crew team members or to prospective team members who have signed the National Letter of Intent with the involved institution or who have been accepted for enrollment in a regular full-time program of studies at that institution, provided the prospects visit the institution at their own expense for this purpose.

"17.4.8.3 Equipment Issue, Squad Pictures. It shall be permissible to designate a single date for issuing crew equipment and for taking squad pictures following the beginning of classes in the fall term or the day prior to the beginning of the traditional or nontraditional segment as specified in 17.4.2.

"17.4.8.3.1 Exception for Sundays. If the day prior to the beginning of a traditional or nontraditional segment is a Sunday, the member institution may designate the preceding Sat-

urday for issuing equipment and taking squad pictures.

"17.4.9 Waivers for Extraordinary Personnel Losses. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve waivers to the length of the playing season (17.4.1) by modifying the start of preseason practice (17.4.2) for an institution that has suffered extraordinary personnel losses to its crew team due to accident or illness of a disastrous nature.

F. Bylaws: Amend 17.10, pages 280-284, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

#### "17.10 ICE HOCKEY

"Regulations for computing the ice hockey playing season are set forth in 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. **Institutions that conduct women's ice hockey shall comply with the same playing and practice season legislation that currently exists for men's ice hockey.**

[17.10.1 through 17.10.4 unchanged.]

#### "17.10.5 Number of Contests

"17.10.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of **women's ice hockey in all divisions to 34 and in the sport of men's ice hockey during the institution's ice hockey playing season to the following number of contests (games or scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under 17.10.5.5.**

"(a) Division I — 34.

"(b) Division II — 32.

"(c) Division III — 25.

[Remainder of 17.10.5.1 will be editorially amended to reflect the adoption of this legislation.]

G. Bylaws: Amend 17 by adding new 17.17 (synchronized swimming) and 17.18 (team handball), pages 242-333, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

#### "17. SYNCHRONIZED SWIMMING/TEAM HANDBALL

"Regulations for computing the synchronized swimming and team handball playing seasons are set forth in 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations.

"17.1 Length of Playing Season. The length of an institution's playing season (traditional and nontraditional segments combined) shall be limited to the following:

"(a) Divisions I and II — A maximum of 22 weeks.



"(b) Division III — A maximum of 21 weeks.

"17.\_\_.2 Preseason Practice. A member institution shall not commence practice sessions prior to the following dates:

"17.\_\_.2.1 Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.\_\_.2.2 Nontraditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.\_\_.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not play its first contest (game or scrimmage) with outside competition prior to the following dates:

"17.\_\_.3.1 Traditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.\_\_.3.2 Nontraditional Segment. September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.\_\_.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (meets and scrimmages) in each segment by the following dates:

"(a) Traditional Segment — The conclusion of the national governing body championship; and

"(b) Nontraditional Segment — The last date of final exams for the regular academic year at the institution.

"17.\_\_.5 Number of Dates of Competition

"17.\_\_.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition during the institution's playing season to the following number of contests (meets and scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under 17.\_\_.5.2.

"(a) Synchronized 15  
swimming

"(b) Team handball 20 (including not more than three tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition)

"17.\_\_.5.1.1 In-Season Foreign Competition. A member institution may engage in one or more of its countable dates of competition in one or more foreign countries on one trip during the prescribed playing season. However, except for contests played in Canada and

Mexico or on a certified foreign tour (see 17.23), the institution may not engage in such in-season foreign competition more than once every four years.

"17.\_\_.5.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of dates of competition (this limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

"(a) Synchronized 15  
swimming

"(b) Team handball 20 (including not more than three tournaments that are counted as single dates of competition)

"17.\_\_.5.3 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition shall exclude the following:

"(a) Conference Championship. Competition in one conference championship meet;

"(b) National Governing Body Championship Competition. Competition in the national governing body championship;

"(c) Alumni Meet. One date of competition each year with an alumni team of the institution;

"(d) Foreign Team in United States. One date of competition each year with a foreign opponent in the United States.

"(e) Certified Foreign Tour. The dates of competition on a foreign tour, provided the tour occurs only once in a four-year period and is certified by the member institution in accordance with the procedures set forth in 30.7 (see 17.23);

"(f) Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico. Any dates of competition in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, respectively, either against or under the sponsorship of an active member institution located in Hawaii, Alaska or Puerto Rico, by a member institution located outside the area in question;

"(g) National Championships and International Competition. Competition in national championships; Olympic, Pan American and World



University Games qualifying competition, provided the student-athlete(s) is not representing the member institution in the competition and receives not more than actual and necessary expenses (including entry fees) from the member institution;

"(h) Fund-Raising Activity. Any activities in which student-athletes from more than one of the institution's athletics teams participate with and against alumni and friends of the institution, the purpose of which is to raise funds for the benefit of the institution's athletics or other programs, provided the student-athletes do not miss classes as a result of their participation; and

"(i) Celebrity Sports Activity. Competition involving a limit of two student-athletes from a member institution's team who participate in local celebrity activities in the applicable sport conducted for the purpose of raising funds for charitable organizations, provided:

"(1) The student-athletes do not miss classes as a result of the participation;

"(2) The involvement of the student-athletes has the approval of the institution's athletics director; and

"(3) The activity takes place within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus.

"17.\_\_.6 Out-of-Season Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the institution's declared playing season per 17.\_\_.1.

"17.\_\_.6.1 Summer Practice. Practice that is organized or financially supported by a member institution shall be prohibited during the summer unless specifically authorized in the bylaws (e.g., foreign tour) or through official interpretations approved by the Council.

"17.\_\_.7 Camps and Clinics. There are no limits on the number of student-athletes who may be employed (e.g., as counselors) in camps or clinics (also see 13.13). Currently enrolled student-athletes may not participate as campers in their institution's camps or clinics.

"17.\_\_.8 Other Restrictions.

"17.\_\_.8.1 Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition.

"17.\_\_.8.1.1 Division I — During Academic Year. In Division I, a student-athlete who partici-

pates during the academic year as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., team invitational meet, exhibition meets or other activity) except while representing the institution in intercollegiate competition shall be ineligible for intercollegiate competition for the remainder of the year and for the next academic year (see 14.7.5 and 14.7.6 for exceptions and waivers).

"17.\_\_.8.1.1.1 Division I Vacation Period Exception. A Division I student-athlete may compete outside of the institution's declared playing and practice season as a member of an outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition during any official vacation period published in the institution's catalog.

"17.\_\_.8.1.2 Divisions II and III — In Season. A Division II or III student-athlete shall be denied eligibility for intercollegiate competition for the remainder of the season if, following enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate squad or team, she competes or has competed as a member of any outside team in any noncollegiate, amateur competition (e.g., team invitational meet, exhibition meets or other activity) during the institution's intercollegiate season (see 14.7.5 and 14.7.6 for exceptions and waivers).

"17.\_\_.8.1.3 Waivers/Exceptions. A student-athlete may compete on an outside team in the following circumstances during the institution's academic year in Division I and during the intercollegiate season in Divisions II and III without jeopardizing his or her eligibility:

"(a) The official Olympic Games and the final tryouts therefor;

"(b) Tryouts and competition approved per 14.7.6; and

"(c) One game per year involving players from the student-athlete's former high school and its alumni team, provided such competition takes place during an official vacation period of the institution's academic year.

"17.\_\_.8.1.4 Out of Season. A member institution may permit not more than the following number of student-athletes from the same



member institution with eligibility remaining in intercollegiate to practice or compete out of season on an outside amateur cross country team:

“(a) Division I — No limitations (competition on an outside team permitted only during the summer, except as provided in 17.\_\_.8.1.1.1).

“(b) Divisions II and III — No limitations.

“17.\_\_.8.1.4.1 Involvement of Coaching Staff Member — Divisions I and II. No member of the coaching staff of a Division I or II member institution may be involved in any capacity (e.g., coach, official, player or league/team administrator) during the academic year (including vacation periods during the academic year) with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with eligibility remaining from the institution's team except as provided under 14.7.6 and 17.23.

“17.\_\_.8.1.4.2 Involvement of Coaching Staff Member — Division III. No member of the coaching staff of a Division III member institution may be involved in any capacity (e.g., coach, official, player or league/team administrator) at any time (i.e., during the academic year, vacation periods and summer) with an outside team that involves any student-athlete with eligibility remaining from the institution's team except as provided under 14.7.6 and 17.23.

“17.\_\_.8.2 Medical Exams. Medical exams may be administered at any time to enrolled team members or to prospective team members who have signed the National Letter of Intent with the involved institution or who have been accepted for enrollment in a regular full-time program of studies at that institution, provided the prospects visit the institution at their own expense for this purpose.

“17.\_\_.8.3 Equipment Issue, Squad Pictures

“17.\_\_.8.3.1 Divisions I and II. No limitations.

“17.\_\_.8.3.2 Division III. It shall be permissible to designate a single date for issuing equipment and for taking squad pictures following the beginning of classes in the fall term or the day prior to the beginning of the traditional or nontraditional segment as specified

in 17.\_\_.2.

“17.\_\_.8.3.2.1 Exception for Sundays. If the day prior to the beginning of a traditional or nontraditional segment is a Sunday, the member institution may designate the preceding Saturday for issuing equipment and taking squad pictures.

“17.\_\_.9 Waivers for Extraordinary Personnel Losses. The Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may approve waivers to the length of the playing season (17.\_\_.1) by modifying the start of preseason practice (17.\_\_.2) for an institution that has suffered extraordinary personnel losses to its team due to accident or illness of a disastrous nature.”

H. Bylaws: Amend 17.20, pages 325-328, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

“17.20 WATER POLO

“Regulations for computing the water polo playing season are set forth in 17.1, General Playing-Season Regulations. **Institutions that conduct women's water polo shall comply with the same playing and practice season legislation that currently exists for men's water polo.**

[Remainder of 17.20 unchanged.]

I. Bylaws: Amend 20.9.3.3, pages 263-264, as follows:

[Division I only]

“20.9.3.3 Minimum Contests and Participants Requirement for Sports Sponsorship. In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution's team shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum contests requirements. The following minimums are applicable:

Individual Sports	Minimum Contests	Minimum Participants
“Women's Archery	8 5	5”

[Remainder of 20.9.3.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Council.

Effective Date: August 1, 1996.

Rationale: At the 1995 NCAA Convention, the membership voted to establish a timetable for the application of NCAA legislation to emerging sports for women. The personnel and playing-and-practice season limitations will be applicable to these sports beginning with the 1996-97 academic year. The staff was directed



by the Council to conduct a study on personnel and playing and practice season limitations for emerging sports for women and to submit appropriate legislation to the membership at the 1996 Convention. As a result, the staff developed recommendations related to the application of Bylaws 11 and 17 to the emerging sports for women. These recommendations were the result of information and suggestions obtained from the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics, member conferences and institutions that conduct an emerging sport on a club or varsity level, and from the applicable national governing bodies for the emerging sports.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 99-1, 99-2, 99-3 and 99-4. Part C adopted by Division II. Parts D, E, F, G and H adopted by Divisions II and III.

**NO. 99-1 COACHING LIMITS AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — EMERGING SPORTS FOR WOMEN — CREW**

**Intent:** To permit two additional coaching staff members for institutions that conduct lightweight crew as well as heavyweight crew.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 99 by adding new 11.7.4.2.7, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"11.7.4.2.7 Exception for Lightweight Crew. A Division I institution that conducts a rowing program that includes a heavyweight crew and a lightweight crew may employ two additional coaches. Each of the institution's crews must have at least one 'eight' or two 'fours' that compete in at least four spring events."**

**Source:** All members of the Ivy Group.

**Rationale:** Increasingly, institutions are expanding rowing programs to include both lightweight and heavyweight crews to allow competitive opportunities for the maximum number of rowers. For safety reasons, it is important that additional rowers be properly supervised. This amendment accommodates the status quo and allows for a smooth transition for the sport to the NCAA.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

**NO. 99-2 COACHING LIMITS AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — EMERGING SPORTS FOR WOMEN — CREW**

[**Note:** Upon the recommendation of the parliamentarian, the chair intends to rule amendment-to-amendment No. 99-2 out of order.]

**Intent:** To permit crew teams to take winter training trips, which

are not within a continuous part of the declared playing season, but count against the number of weeks in the season.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 99-E by adding new 17.4.1.1, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"17.4.1.1 Winter Training Trip. A single winter training trip, for practice only, shall be permitted between the nontraditional and traditional segments, provided that the trip does not exceed two weeks and is counted as part of the 26-week playing-and-practice season limitation."**

**Source:** All members of the Ivy Group.

**Rationale:** Rowing can be practiced effectively only outdoors on a large body of water. Allowing institutions to use up to two weeks on a winter training trip lessens the advantage enjoyed by teams located in warmer climates. This amendment accommodates the status quo and allows for a smooth transition for the sport to the NCAA.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

**NO. 99-3 COACHING LIMITS AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASON — EMERGING SPORTS FOR WOMEN — CREW**

**Intent:** In the sport of women's rowing, to exempt competition in any one season-ending championship event.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 99-E, 17.4.5.3, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"17.4.5.3 Annual Crew Exemptions.** The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of crew shall exclude the following:

[17.4.5.3-(a) unchanged.]

**"(b) United States Rowing Association Championship.** Competition in the U.S. Rowing Association Championship.

**"(b) Season-Ending Championship Event. Season-ending competition in one of the recognized national collegiate rowing championship events for which the institution is qualified and eligible to participate (e.g., Cincinnati Regatta, Intercollegiate Rowing Association Regatta, Dad Vail Regatta, Champion International Regatta)."**

[Remainder of 17.4.5.3 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Ivy Group.

**Rationale:** The U.S. Rowing Association Championship is a club championship held in August, not a collegiate championship and is, therefore, not the appropriate event to exclude from having to be counted in the contest limitations. Collegiate crews currently



compete in different season-ending events depending on their affiliations. This proposal will accommodate the status quo.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

**NO. 99-4 COACHING LIMITS AND PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASON — EMERGING SPORTS FOR WOMEN — CREW**

**Intent:** To change the end of the traditional segment for women's rowing from the U.S. Rowing Association Championship to the Cincinnati Regatta.

**Bylaws:** Amend Proposal No. 99-E, 17.4.4, as follows:

[Division I only]

"17.4.4 End of Regular Playing Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (games and scrimmages) in each segment in the sport of crew by the following dates:

"(a) Traditional Segment — The conclusion of the U.S. Rowing Association Championship **Cincinnati Regatta**; and"

[Remainder of 17.4.4 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Ivy Group.

**Rationale:** The Cincinnati Regatta is the final championship event of the collegiate rowing season and is, therefore, the appropriate event to mark the end of the traditional playing season.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

**Recruiting**

**NO. 100 (NO. 2-22) RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS — DIVISIONS I AND II BASKETBALL**

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II basketball, to permit one telephone call to a prospect prior to July 1, and to specify that the call may not occur prior to June 1 or the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school, whichever is later.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.01.6 by adding new 13.01.6.1, page 84, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.01.6.1 **Exception — Divisions I and II Basketball.** In the sports of Divisions I and II basketball, one telephone call to a prospect (or a prospect's relatives or legal guardians) may be made during the month of June immediately following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.3.1 by adding new 13.1.3.1.2, page 91, as

A-220 \_\_\_\_\_ 1996 Convention Proceedings

follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.3.1 Time Period for Telephone Calls — General Rule. In Divisions I and II sports other than football, telephone calls to a prospect (or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians) may not be made prior to July 1 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school; thereafter, staff members shall not make such telephone calls more than once per week.

[13.1.3.1.1 unchanged.]

"13.1.3.1.2 **Exception — Divisions I and II Basketball.** In the sports of Divisions I and II basketball, one telephone call to a prospect (or a prospect's relatives or legal guardians) may be made during the month of June immediately following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school."

**Source:** NCAA Council and all members of the Big Ten Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Current legislation does not allow basketball prospects to be contacted until July 1 following the completion of the prospects' junior year in high school. This does not allow enough time for basketball coaches to determine mutual interest or identify the summer camps that prospects will be attending, which inhibits the ability of coaches to effectively plan travel and recruiting activities during the July evaluation period. This proposal will allow a coach to place one call to a prospect prior to July 1 to obtain this information, which then will allow the coach to target recruiting and save travel costs. The call may not be made prior to June 1, and the prospect must have completed his or her junior year in high school before the institution can initiate this telephone contact.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Defeated by Divisions I and II.

**NO. 101 (NO. 2-23) RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS — DIVISIONS I AND II ICE HOCKEY**

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II ice hockey, to permit one telephone call per week to a prospect from April 15 through May 15 of the prospect's junior year in high school.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.01.6 by adding new 13.01.6.1, page 84, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.01.6.1 **Exception — Divisions I and II Ice Hockey.** In Divisions I and II ice hockey, one telephone call per week may be made to a prospect from April 15 through May 15 of the prospect's junior year in high school."

Legislative Proposals \_\_\_\_\_ A-221



**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.3.1 by adding new 13.1.3.1.2, page 91, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.3.1 Time Period for Telephone Calls — General Rule. In Divisions I and II sports other than football, telephone calls to a prospect (or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians) may not be made prior to July 1 following the completion of the prospect's junior year in high school; thereafter, staff members shall not make such telephone calls more than once per week.

[13.1.3.1.1 unchanged.]

**"13.1.3.1.2 Exception — Divisions I and II Ice Hockey. In Divisions I and II ice hockey, one telephone call per week may be made to a prospect from April 15 through May 15 of the prospect's junior year in high school."**

**Source:** Brown University, Clarkson University, Colgate University, Cornell University, Dartmouth College, Harvard University, Lake Superior State University, Merrimack College, Princeton University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, St. Lawrence University, Union College (New York), University of Vermont and Yale University.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** Prospects in the sport of men's ice hockey have an alternative to college hockey in the Canadian junior hockey leagues. In recent years, representatives of the Canadian junior hockey leagues have become notably more aggressive in the recruitment of young hockey players. As a result, ice hockey prospects, particularly those in Canada, are being asked as early as their sophomore year in high school to make important decisions regarding their future without being able to weigh appropriate information regarding college hockey. This legislation will permit NCAA hockey coaches to provide prospects with information regarding college hockey programs, enabling the prospects to make a more informed decision about their future.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Divisions I and II.

#### **NO. 102 (NO. 2-24) RECRUITING — WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE — STUDENT-ATHLETES**

**Intent:** To specify that currently enrolled student-athletes may not engage in written correspondence with prospects at the direction of a coach or at the expense of the institution.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.02.5.1, pages 85-86, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.02.5.1 Permissible Recruitment Activities for Enrolled Stu-

dent-Athletes:

[13.02.5.1-(a) and 13.02.5.1-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) Written Correspondence. It is permissible for an enrolled student-athlete to engage in written correspondence, *even when* **provided it is not** done at the direction and/or expense of the member institution.

[Remainder of 13.02.5.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Big Ten Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The area of general correspondence from enrolled student-athletes to prospects has become difficult to regulate. Although deregulating the applicable legislation could have been viewed as a solution, it raises concerns about how student-athletes are being used to recruit prospects. Existing legislation that allows student-athletes to write to prospects at the direction of the coach and at the expense of the institution has resulted in instances of coaches requiring student-athletes to engage in letter-writing campaigns to prospects on a regular basis and sending packages of letters by express mail. Not only is this practice costly, but a student-athlete should not be subject to such a requirement. This proposal continues to allow student-athletes to write prospects on their own and at their own expense.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted in Divisions I and II.

#### **NO. 103 (NO. 2-25) DIVISION I BASKETBALL — EVALUATION DAYS**

**Intent:** In Division I basketball, to permit 40 evaluation days in a maximum of 40 days, and to define an evaluation day as one coach engaged in the evaluation of any prospect on one day.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.02 by adding new 13.02.7, page 86, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"13.02.7 Evaluation Days. An evaluation day is defined as one coach engaged in the evaluation of any prospect on one day (12:01 a.m. to midnight); two coaches making evaluations on the same day shall use two evaluation days. The combined total of such days for all staff members shall not exceed 40."**

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.9 by adding new 13.1.9.4, page 94, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"13.1.9.4 Evaluation Days — Division I Men's and Women's**



**Basketball. In Division I men's and women's basketball, each institution is limited to 40 evaluation days, per 13.02.7."**

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 30.10.1, pages 417-418, as follows:

[Division I only]

"30.10.1 Basketball, Division I Men's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to men's basketball in Division I:

[30.10.1-(a) through 30.10.1-(c) unchanged.]

"(d) November 17 through March 15 [except for (1) and (2) below] — *Twenty* **Forty evaluation days per 13.02.7** selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics; institutional staff members shall not visit a prospect's educational institution on more than one calendar day during this period."

Evaluation Period

[Remainder of 30.10.1 unchanged.]

**D. Bylaws:** Amend 30.10.2, pages 418-419, as follows:

[Division I only]

"30.10.2 Basketball, Division I Women's. The following contact and evaluation periods shall apply to women's basketball in Division I:

[30.10.2-(a) and 30.10.2-(b) unchanged.]

"(c) October 8 through the last day in February [except for (1) and (2) below] — *Twenty* **Forty evaluation days per 13.02.7** selected at the discretion of the member institution and designated in writing in the office of the director of athletics; institutional staff members shall not visit a prospect's educational institution on more than one calendar day during this period [except for (1) below]:

Evaluation Period

[Remainder of 30.10.2 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal will eliminate the term "calendar days" in Division I basketball and establish "evaluation days." The basketball coaches associations believe that this will provide greater recruiting effectiveness and efficiency without providing any increase in cost. For example, currently, if one coach leaves

campus to evaluate, the institution often finds it necessary to send another coach since one of the 20 days would be used regardless of whether one or two coaches are off campus.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

#### NO. 104 (NO. 2-27) RECRUITING — DIVISION I BASKETBALL

**Intent:** In Division I basketball, to specify that an institution has five recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations combined) during the academic year and that not more than three of the five recruiting opportunities may be in-person, off-campus contacts.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.7, page 93, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.7 Permissible Number of Contacts. In sports other than Divisions I-A and I-AA football and **Division I basketball**, each institution shall be limited to three in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site (which shall include contacts made with the prospect's relatives or legal guardians but shall not include contacts made during an official visit per 13.7). In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, each institution shall be limited to seven in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts per prospect at any site (which shall include contacts made with the prospect's relatives or legal guardians, but shall not include contacts made during an official visit per 13.7). **In Division I basketball, each institution shall be limited to five recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations combined) per prospect and not more than three of the five opportunities may be contacts.**"

[Remainder of 13.1.7 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.9, page 95, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.9 Limitations on Number of Evaluations — All Sports. In sports other than Division I football and basketball, institutional staff members shall not evaluate a prospect on more than four occasions during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team (e.g., high-school team, all-star team, club team). In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, institutional staff members shall be limited to two evaluations during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team. Not more than one evaluation may be used during the fall evaluation period and not more than one evaluation may be used during the May evaluation period per Bylaw 30.10.5. In Division I basketball, *institutional staff members are limited to two evaluations per prospect during the academic year* **each institution shall be limited to five recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations combined) per prospect and not more**



than three of the five opportunities may be contacts.”

[Remainder of 13.1.9 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal originated from the National Association of Basketball Coaches and Women's Basketball Coaches Association. Over the past few years, the NCAA Legislative Review Committee and the Recruiting Committee have reviewed the concept of recruiting opportunities but were concerned about the impact of this legislation on other recruiting legislation. The Recruiting Committee now believes the recruiting opportunity concept will have little impact on other legislation. The legislation allows for more evaluation, if necessary, without increasing overall travel costs. The Recruiting Committee believes that this proposal is a recruiting calendar issue and notes that basketball coaches are in support of this change and that recruiting costs will not increase as a result of the proposal.

**Action:** Motion to refer defeated by Division I. Proposal adopted.

#### NO. 105 (NO. 2-26) RECRUITING — ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS — DIVISIONS I AND II

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II, to specify that facsimiles and electronic mail communications are subject to restrictions on general correspondence, rather than the restrictions applicable to telephone calls.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.02.12, page 87, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and III, divided vote]

“13.02.12 Telephone Calls — **Divisions I and II.** For purposes of this bylaw, the definition of a telephone call **does not** include a facsimile or other electronically transmitted correspondence (e.g., electronic mail).”

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-99, as follows:

[Division I only]

“13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I):

“(a) Correspondence. General correspondence, including letters,

facsimiles and electronic mail in Division I, postcards issued by the U.S. postal service (i.e., blank cards) and institutional note cards may be sent to a prospect. In Division I, attachments to general correspondence may include materials printed on plain white paper with black ink. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, the content of all general recruiting correspondence to prospects (or prospects' parents or legal guardians) must be prepared by the head coach or one of the full-time assistant coaches. In addition, restricted-earnings coaches, which in the sport of football are permissible only in Division I-AA and at the national service academies in Division I-A, may prepare such correspondence.”

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council and all members of the Ivy Group.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** In this age of advanced technology it is more cost-effective to use facsimiles or electronic mail to communicate with prospects than to send printed materials via mail or courier; however, these forms of communication do not replace the value of a telephone conversation for the value and types of information that can be exchanged. Electronic transmissions also do not intrude on a prospect's time in the way telephone contacts do, which is one of the primary reasons that telephone contacts are regulated. This proposal will allow important information to be exchanged cost-effectively and efficiently without counting as a telephone contact.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee opposed this proposal. The committee discussed both the merits and the drawbacks of the proposal and agreed to oppose the proposal but would like to study it further.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I. Withdrawn in Division III.

#### NO. 106 (NO. 2-28) RECRUITING — EVALUATIONS SUBSEQUENT TO SIGNING — DIVISION II

[Note: The sponsors have indicated their intent to withdraw the following proposal.]

**Intent:** To permit Division II institutions that already have signed a prospective student-athlete to contact the prospect on the day or days of competition.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.7.3, page 94, as follows:

[Division II only]

“13.1.7.3 Contacts Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment. Subsequent to the calendar day on which a prospect signs a National Letter of Intent, there shall be no limit on the number of contacts by the institution with which the prospect has signed. For an institution not utiliz-



ing the National Letter of Intent in a particular sport, there shall be no limit on the number of contacts with the prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) by that institution subsequent to the calendar day of the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. However, the following conditions continue to apply:

[13.1.7.3-(a) through 13.1.7.3-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) Contact at the site of a prospect's competition shall continue to be governed by the provisions of 13.1.8.2, except that contact with the prospect's relatives or legal guardians at the site of the prospect's competition shall be permitted."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.8.2, pages 94-95, as follows:

[Division II only]

"13.1.8.2 Practice or Competition Site. Recruiting contact may not be made with a prospect **who has not signed a National Letter of Intent** prior to any athletics competition in which the prospect is a participant during the day or days of competition, even if the prospect is on an official or unofficial visit. Such contact shall be governed by the following:"

[Remainder of 13.1.8.2 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal has been presented to the Recruiting Committee by numerous coaches associations. Once a prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent, a coach should have the opportunity to talk to the prospect at the practice or competition site.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division II.

#### NO. 107 (NO. 2-29) RECRUITING — NOTES

**Intent:** To prohibit an institutional staff member from providing a prospect with a note at practice or competition sites, including summer events, even if the note is delivered by a third party, and to specify that general correspondence may be sent to a prospect only by mail.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.8.2, pages 94-95, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.1.8.2 Practice or Competition Site. Recruiting contact may not be made with a prospect prior to any athletics competition in which the prospect is a participant during the day or days of competition, even if the prospect is on an official or unofficial visit. Such contact **includes the passing of notes to a prospect by a third party on behalf of an institutional staff member** and shall be governed by the following:

[Remainder of 13.1.8.2 unchanged.]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-99, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I):

"(a) Correspondence. General correspondence, including letters, postcards issued by the U.S. postal service (i.e., blank cards) and institutional note cards may be sent to a prospect **only by mail**. In Division I, attachments to general correspondence may include materials printed on plain white paper with black ink. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, the content of all general recruiting correspondence to prospects (or prospects' parents or legal guardians) must be prepared by the head coach or one of the full-time assistant coaches. In addition, restricted-earnings coaches, which in the sport of football are permissible only in Division I-AA and at the national service academies in Division I-A, may prepare such correspondence."

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The issue of notes being passed from a coach to a prospect by a third party is significant and this practice should be precluded. The use of intermediaries already is a significant problem in the recruiting process and efforts should be made to eliminate using these individuals in this way. Recruiting correspondence with a prospect should be sent through the mail, in order to avoid the participation of such third parties in the recruiting process.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 108 (NO. 2-30) EVALUATIONS — STATE TOURNAMENTS — DIVISION II

**Intent:** In Division II, to permit coaching staff members to evaluate prospects at a state high-school tournament that occurs within the state in which the institution is located without counting it as an evaluation for any prospect.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.9.7.1 by adding new 13.1.9.7.1.1, page 96, as follows:



[Division II only]

**"13.1.9.7.1.1 Exception — Division II Basketball.** In Division II basketball, evaluation of contests in the state high-school basketball tournament that occurs within the state in which the member institution is located shall not count as an evaluation for any of the participating prospects."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Coaches should be permitted to evaluate prospects at state championships that occur within their own state and not have to be concerned with exceeding the evaluation limit for a prospect. The Recruiting Committee has cited examples of coaching staff members at NCAA institutions who were unable to attend the state high-school tournament due to the possibility of exceeding the maximum number of evaluations for a prospect.

**Action:** Adopted by Division II.

#### NO. 109 (NO. 2-31) EVALUATIONS — OLYMPIC FESTIVAL TRYOUTS — DIVISION II

**Intent:** In Division II, to permit coaching staff members to evaluate prospects at the Olympic Festival Tryouts without having to count the observation as an evaluation in women's basketball.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.9.7.2, page 96, as follows:

[Division II only]

"13.1.9.7.2 Women's Basketball — Olympic Festival Tryouts. In Division II, valuations on more than one day at official tryouts for the USA Basketball Olympic Festival conducted during a permissible evaluation period (see 30.10.2 and 30.10.4) shall not count as a single an evaluation for women's basketball."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Many coaches take their own student-athletes to the Olympic Festival tryouts and, because there are prospective student-athletes present, they cannot watch their own players without counting it as an evaluation for the participating prospects.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division II.

#### NO. 110 (NO. 2-32) RECRUITING — EVALUATIONS SUBSEQUENT TO SIGNING — DIVISION I

**Intent:** In Division I, to delete the legislation that permits an unlimited number of evaluations by an institution with which a

prospective student-athlete has signed a National Letter of Intent.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.9.10, pages 96-97, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.1.9.10 Evaluations Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment. Subsequent to the calendar day on which a prospect signs a National Letter of Intent, there shall be no limit on the number of evaluations by the institution with which the prospect has signed. For an institution that does not utilize the National Letter of Intent, there shall be no limit on the number of evaluations with the prospect subsequent to the calendar day of the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid."

**Source:** All members of the Big Ten Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The adoption of 1995 NCAA Convention Proposal No. 4 allowed an institution unlimited evaluations of a prospect who has signed with that institution, similar to legislation allowing an unlimited number of contacts with signed prospects. Although originally intended to provide more evaluation opportunities for unsigned prospects, there are very few situations, if any, in which additional evaluation opportunities will occur. The original legislation also was misunderstood by coaches in that they believed they no longer would need to monitor evaluations of other prospects participating in events in which one of their signed prospects also is participating. The legislation has created confusion and misunderstanding in its application, and does not result in "unlimited" evaluation opportunities as proposed.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee took no position on this proposal.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I.

#### NO. 111 (NO. 2-33) PRINTED RECRUITING MATERIALS — PREENROLLMENT INFORMATION — DIVISIONS I AND II

**Intent:** To permit a Division I or II institution to send preenrollment information to a prospect, provided the prospect has been officially accepted for enrollment by the institution, even though the institution subscribes to the National Letter of Intent program.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-99, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for



teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I):

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) Preenrollment Information. Any necessary preenrollment information regarding orientation, conditioning, academics and practice activities may be sent to a prospect, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or has been officially accepted for enrollment by a member institution that does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent program.”

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Big East Conference.

**Effective Date:** Immediately.\*

**Rationale:** Many prospective student-athletes who intend to walk on to an institution's athletics team currently are unable to receive preenrollment information from those institutions that subscribe to the National Letter of Intent program. Many of these walk-on prospects will call the institution where they intend to enroll and request preenrollment information but are unable to receive this information, inasmuch as they have not signed a National Letter of Intent with that institution. In most cases, the institution does not intend to sign these individuals to a National Letter of Intent; however, it would be in the prospect's best interests to receive the preenrollment information and be better prepared for the academic year. Permitting institutions to provide this preenrollment information to those prospects who have been accepted for enrollment will limit any recruiting advantage and better prepare these walk-ons for the academic year.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted (with immediate effective date) by Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 112 (NO. 2-34) PRINTED RECRUITING MATERIALS — PREENROLLMENT INFORMATION — DIVISION II

**Intent:** To permit a Division II institution to provide preenrollment information to a prospective student-athlete, provided the prospect either has signed a National Letter of Intent or has been officially accepted for enrollment by the institution.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-99, as follows:

[Division II only]

“13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to

athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I):

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) Preenrollment Information. **In Division I, any necessary** preenrollment information regarding orientation, conditioning, academics and practice activities may be sent to a prospect, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or has been officially accepted for enrollment by a member institution that does not subscribe to the National Letter of Intent program. **In Division II, such preenrollment information may be provided after the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent with the institution and/or has been officially accepted for enrollment by the institution.**”

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** Augustana College (South Dakota); California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; California State University, Stanislaus; Lincoln Memorial University; Mankato State University; University of North Dakota; North Dakota State University; University of Northern Colorado; University of Northern Kentucky; Northern Michigan University; Sonoma State University; South Dakota State University; Texas A&M University-Kingsville; and Wayne State College (Nebraska).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Many prospective student-athletes in Division II are recruited but are not offered financial aid or signed to a National Letter of Intent. However, these students have been accepted for enrollment at an institution and plan to participate in intercollegiate athletics. In addition, many times prospects who have been accepted for enrollment will notify coaches of their intention to walk on to the team. Under current legislation, a coach is prohibited from sending information regarding conditioning to these prospects; thus, the health and safety of the prospects are jeopardized since they may not be in proper physical condition when practice begins.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Moot in Division II.

#### NO. 113 (NO. 2-35) PRINTED RECRUITING MATERIALS — GAME PROGRAMS — DIVISION II

**Intent:** To permit a Division II institution to provide game programs



to prospects during official and unofficial visits.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-99, as follows:

[Division II only]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I):

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) **Programs—** *Division I Only.* **Game programs (which may not include posters) may be provided to prospects only during official and unofficial recruiting visits and may not be mailed."**

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Lone Star Conference, Augustana College (South Dakota); California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; California State University, Stanislaus; Henderson State University; Lincoln Memorial University; Mankato State University; University of North Dakota; North Dakota State University; University of Northern Colorado; University of Northern Kentucky; Northern Michigan University; Sonoma State University; South Dakota State University; Texas A&M University-Kingsville; and Wayne State College (Nebraska).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This proposal will clarify and simplify the printed recruiting material legislation by allowing game programs to be provided to prospects in both Divisions I and II during official and unofficial visits and will prevent inadvertent violations of this rule. Division II institutions already produce game programs, and allowing coaches to give the programs to prospects during campus visits will not result in any increased costs to the institution.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal and agrees that adding game programs to the list of permissible recruiting materials is reasonable and will not result in significant additional costs.

**Action:** Adopted by Division II.

**NO. 114 (NO. 2-36) PRINTED RECRUITING MATERIALS  
— SCHEDULE CARDS — DIVISIONS I  
AND II**

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II, to add schedule cards to the list of per-

A-234 1996 Convention Proceedings

missible recruiting materials.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.1, pages 98-99, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II — Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I):

[13.4.1-(a) through 13.4.1-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) **Schedule Cards. One wallet-size playing schedule card per sport."**

[13.4.1-(i) and 13.4.1-(j) relettered as 13.4.1-(j) and 13.4.1-(k), unchanged.]

[Remainder of 13.4.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the Big Sky Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** At the 1994 NCAA Convention, the list of permissible recruiting materials was substantially reduced in the spirit of cost containment. Schedule cards were eliminated as part of the package. These cards are of zero to negligible cost to the institution. Thus, institutions should be permitted to send schedule cards to prospective student-athletes.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal and agrees that adding schedule cards to the list of permissible recruiting materials is reasonable and will not result in significant additional costs.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I and II.

**NO. 115 (NO. 2-37) RECRUITING — OFFICIAL VISITS  
PRIOR TO EARLY SIGNING PERIOD**

**Intent:** To increase from seven to nine the number of core courses a prospect must present in order to take an official visit prior to the early National Letter of Intent signing period.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.1.2.4, page 103, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.7.1.2.4 Academic Credentials for Official Visit Prior to Early Signing Period. A Division I member institution may provide an expense-paid visit to a prospect in a sport that has an early signing period for the National Letter of Intent prior to the initial

Legislative Proposals A-235



early signing date in that sport only if the prospect has presented the institution with a minimum combined SAT score of 700 or PSAT score of 70 or a minimum composite ACT or PLAN (or PACT Plus) score of 17, and also has presented a minimum 2.000 grade-point average in at least *seven* **nine** core courses (per 14.3.1.1). A prospect in the applicable sports who does not present these academic credentials shall not begin an official visit until 24 hours after the last day of the early signing period in that sport.

"13.7.1.2.4.1 Academic Transcripts/Form 48-H. The institution must receive from the high school an official academic transcript and a Form 48-H in order to verify that the prospect has achieved the 2.000 grade-point average in at least *seven* **nine** core courses."

[Remainder of 13.7.1.2.4 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Special Committee to Oversee Implementation of the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Incoming freshmen are required to present 13 core-course units in order to be considered qualifiers. This increase parallels the Association's other increases in initial-eligibility standards and is a better indicator as to whether or not a prospective student-athlete will be a qualifier.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

#### NO. 116 (NO. 2-38) ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS FOR OFFICIAL VISIT PRIOR TO EARLY SIGNING PERIOD

**Intent:** To delete the requirement that the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse must certify the test score, grade-point average and core courses that a prospective student-athlete must have before making an official visit prior to the initial signing date in a sport that has an early signing period for the National Letter of Intent.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.1.2.4.4, page 103, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.7.1.2.4.4 Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse. The prospect's fulfillment of these academic requirements shall be certified by an initial-eligibility clearinghouse approved by the Council."

**Source:** All members of the Pacific-10 Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The clearinghouse should not be required to certify that a prospective student-athlete has met the academic requirements for an official visit prior to the initial signing date in a sport that has an early signing period for the National Letter of

Intent. The member institution can obtain this information in a timely manner. The clearinghouse still must issue the final certification prior to the prospect becoming eligible for financial aid, practice and competition.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee opposes this proposal. The committee reaffirmed its earlier position not to support any recommendations to modify the academic credentials required for an early official visit or permitting institutional officials (as opposed to the clearinghouse) to issue certifications. The committee continues to believe that the clearinghouse is the appropriate entity to make certification decisions and that institutions should not be asked to reestablish systems and procedure to make these decisions.

**Action:** Withdrawn in Division I.

#### NO. 117 RESOLUTION: CERTIFICATION FOR EARLY OFFICIAL VISIT

[Division I only]

"Whereas, the 1993 NCAA Convention adopted legislation to establish the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse; and

"Whereas, the administrative responsibilities assigned to the clearinghouse are numerous and significant; and

"Whereas, these administrative responsibilities include the certification of a prospective student-athlete's academic credentials for an early official visit in a sport that has an early signing period for the National Letter of Intent; and

"Whereas, it may be neither necessary nor desirable for the clearinghouse to certify the eligibility of prospects for early official visits, given the additional administrative responsibilities of the clearinghouse;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Special Committee to Oversee Implementation of the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse and the NCAA Academic Requirements and Recruiting Committees study this issue and submit appropriate recommendations to the NCAA Council for possible consideration by the Division I membership at the 1997 NCAA Convention."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Division I Steering Committee).

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

#### NO. 118 (NO. 2-39) OFFICIAL VISITS — DIVISION I FOOTBALL

**Intent:** To permit a Division I institution to "bank" a maximum of six unused official visits annually in the sport of football, and to specify that the unused visits may be used only during the subsequent academic year.



**Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.1.6, page 104, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I-A and I-AA football, divided vote]

"13.7.1.6 Number of Official Visits — Institutional Limitation. The total number of official visits a Division I institution may provide prospects in the following sports during an academic year shall be limited to:

"(a) Football — 56.

"(b) Basketball — 12.

**"13.7.1.6.1 Unused Visits — Football. In Division I football, an institution may retain a maximum of six unused visits from the previous academic year. The unused visits may be used only during the subsequent academic year."**

[13.7.1.6.1 through 13.7.1.6.6 renumbered as 13.7.1.6.2 through 13.7.1.6.7, unchanged.]

**Source:** University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Louisville; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Oklahoma; Oklahoma State University; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; Texas Christian University; U.S. Naval Academy; and West Virginia University.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The number of football scholarships available in Division I to the incoming freshman class varies each year. Institutions often do not utilize their full complement of official visits, anticipating a small number of grants to be awarded for the ensuing academic year. Conversely, when the maximum number of scholarships are available, the number of official visits could be insufficient. This proposal would enable institutions to "bank" up to six unused official visits provided to prospects from the previous year (e.g., if an institution has used 50 visits in year one, it would have 62 visits available in year two). The unused visits would not carry over more than one year.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal. The committee acknowledged that the number of football scholarships to incoming freshmen varies from year to year.

**Action:** Defeated by Division I-A. Not moved in Division I-AA.

#### **NO. 119 (NO. 2-40) OFFICIAL VISITS — ENTERTAINMENT ALLOWANCE**

**Intent:** In Divisions I and II, to increase from \$20 to \$30 per day the entertainment allowance an institution may provide to a student host entertaining a prospect during an official visit and to increase from \$10 to \$15 the additional daily allowance for each additional prospect entertained by the host.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.7.5.5, page 105, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"13.7.5.5 Student Host. The institution may provide the following to a student host entertaining a prospect:

"(a) A maximum of \$20 **\$30** for each day of the visit to cover all actual costs of entertaining the prospect (and the prospect's parents, legal guardians or spouse), excluding the cost of meals and admission to campus athletics events. These funds may not be used for the purchase of souvenirs such as T-shirts or other institutional mementos. It is permissible to provide the student host with an additional \$10 **\$15** per day for each additional prospect the host entertains.

[13.7.5.5-(b) and 13.7.5.5-(c) unchanged.]

"13.7.5.5.1 Multiple Hosts. If several students host a prospect, the \$20 **\$30** per day entertainment money may be utilized to cover the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the prospect and all hosts. Only one student host per prospect may be provided a free meal if restaurant facilities are utilized."

[Remainder of 13.7.5.5 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council; University of Arkansas, Fayetteville; University of Kentucky; Louisiana State University; University of Louisville; University of Mississippi; Mississippi State University; University of Oklahoma; Oklahoma State University; University of Pittsburgh; University of Tennessee, Knoxville; University of Texas at Austin; Texas Christian University; Texas Tech University; University of Tulsa; and University of Wyoming.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The financial assistance of \$20 provided each day to a student host to entertain a prospect has been in effect since 1982. The proposed increase of \$10 per day is both minimal and practical. If a student hosts multiple prospects, the student would be provided with \$15 for each additional prospect, which is a \$5 increase per additional prospect.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I. Adopted upon reconsideration by Division II.

#### **NO. 120 (NO. 2-41) RECRUITING — NONSCHOLASTIC-BASED BASKETBALL**

**Intent:** To prohibit Divisions I and II coaching staff members from participating on nonscholastic-based basketball teams that include individuals with eligibility remaining or prospective student-athletes.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.12.1.4, page 112, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]



"13.12.1.4 Nonscholastic-Based Basketball. In Divisions I and II, a member of an institution's coaching staff may not participate in coaching activities involving nonscholastic-based basketball teams, regardless of the age or gender of the participants involved in such teams. **In addition, coaching staff members may not participate on such teams that include individuals of prospect age or younger.** In Division III, a member of an institution's coaching staff may not participate in coaching activities involving AAU basketball teams, regardless of the age or gender of the participants involved in such teams."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** This legislation is consistent with the sponsor's original intent, which was to preclude participation by coaching staff members as participants on nonscholastic-based basketball teams as well to preclude them from coaching all such teams.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I and II.

#### NO. 121 (NO. 2-42) DIVISION II TRYOUTS

**Intent:** To permit Division II institutions to conduct tryouts of senior prospects outside the prospects' traditional sports seasons.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.12.2.1, page 112, as follows:

[Division II only]

"13.12.2.1 Division II Tryouts. A Division II member institution may conduct a tryout of a prospect only on its campus and only under the following conditions:

[13.12.2.1-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) The tryout may be conducted only *when, for a high-school student, the seniors prospect who are enrolled in a term other than the term in which the traditional season in the sport occurs or has who have* completed high-school eligibility in the sport and written permission has been obtained from the high school's athletics director; for a two-year college student, after the conclusion of the sport season, and for a four-year college student, after the conclusion of the sport season, provided written permission to contact the prospect (per 13.1.1.3) has been obtained;"

[Remainder of 13.12.2.1 unchanged.]

**Source:** All members of the South Atlantic Conference.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Current legislation does not permit spring sport prospective student-athletes to try out until late in the year. This proposal will permit prospects to gather information about prospective institutions and the chances of participating at those institutions. This legislation also will encourage increased campus visitation

at Division II institutions, thus aiding the admissions process.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Division II.

#### NO. 122 (NO. 2-43) RECRUITING — DIVISION I BASKETBALL EVENT CERTIFICATION

**Intent:** To specify that all noninstitutional basketball events (e.g., camps, leagues, tournaments, shootouts), no matter when they occur, shall be subject to the NCAA basketball event certification program.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.13.5, page 117, as follows:

[Division I only]

"13.13.5 Division I Coaches' Attendance at *Summer* Basketball Events. A member of an institution's basketball coaching staff may attend only institutional *summer* basketball camps per Bylaw 13.13.1.1 and noninstitutional organized events (e.g., camps, leagues, tournaments and festivals) *held during the July evaluation period* that are certified per Bylaw 30.15."

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 30.15, pages 425-426, as follows:

[Division I only]

#### "30.15 SUMMER BASKETBALL EVENT CERTIFICATION

"In order for a *summer* basketball event (e.g., camp, league, tournament or festival) to be certified, a certification application form must be submitted each year to the NCAA national office *not later than April 1*. An event review form for each event also must be submitted to the NCAA national office *not later than October 1* subsequent to the event sessions. The *summer* basketball event certification program is not applicable to noninstitutional organized events that are sponsored or conducted by an applicable national or international governing body (e.g., state high-school all-star games, international competitions, U.S. Olympic Festival). The following criteria must be met by each event in order to be certified:

"(a) Admissions fees charged to all event participants must be similar;

"(b) Noninstitutional events shall not employ any Division I coaches;

"(c) No air or ground transportation or other gifts or inducements shall be provided to the event participants or their coaches or relatives;

"(d) A prospective student-athlete who attends an NCAA certified event shall not retain any athletics equipment provided for his or her use at the event other than an event T-shirt; and

"(e) Compensation provided to event personnel shall be commensurate with the going rate for event personnel of like



teaching ability and event experience."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Recruiting Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Many basketball event operators have moved events that used to occur during the Division I July evaluation period to the fall contact period and/or the spring evaluation period in order to avoid the NCAA summer basketball certification program. This proposal would specify that a Division I basketball coaching staff member may attend only those noninstitutional basketball events that are certified by the NCAA, regardless of when they occur.

**Action:** Adopted by Division I.

#### NO. 123 (NO. 2-44) RECRUITING — PRECOLLEGE EXPENSE — WOMEN'S CREW

**Intent:** To permit a member institution to loan crew equipment to high schools' and junior club programs' women's teams on an issuance and retrieval basis, and to permit an institution to allow high schools' and junior club programs' women's teams to use its crew facilities for practice and/or competition.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.16.1.5.1 by adding new 13.16.1.5.1.1, page 119, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

**"13.16.1.5.1.1 Exception — Women's Crew. An institution may loan crew equipment to a high school's or junior club program's women's team on an issuance and retrieval basis, and may permit high schools' and junior club programs' women's teams to use its crew facilities for practice and/or competition."**

**Source:** NCAA Council and all members of the Ivy Group.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Rowing equipment is expensive and is manufactured by only a limited number of boat builders. Because of this expense, most high school rowing programs are able to afford only one or two racing shells. If this fragile equipment is damaged during the racing season, repairs often are impossible to make in a timely way. College programs provide the only alternative for an immediate source of such equipment, on a temporary loan basis, allowing affected high schools to salvage their rowing season.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions I and II. Moot in Division III.

#### NO. 124 (NO. 2-45) RECRUITING — PRECOLLEGE EXPENSE — WOMEN'S CREW

**Intent:** To permit a member institution to loan crew equipment to

high schools' and junior club programs' women's teams on an issuance and retrieval basis.

**Bylaws:** Amend 13.16.1.5 by adding new 13.16.1.5.1.1, page 119, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Federated provision, all divisions, divided vote]

**"13.16.1.5.1.1 Exception — Women's Crew. A member institution may loan crew equipment to a high school's or junior club program's women's team (which may include prospects) on an issuance and retrieval basis."**

**Source:** NCAA Council; Colgate University; George Washington University; Georgetown University; Hobart and William Smith Colleges; College of the Holy Cross; Ithaca College; Mercyhurst College; University of New Hampshire; Rutgers University, New Brunswick; Syracuse University; Wesleyan University (Connecticut); and Williams College.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Rowing equipment is expensive and is manufactured by only a limited number of boat builders. Because of this expense, most high school rowing programs are able to afford only one or two racing shells. If this fragile equipment is damaged during the racing season, repairs often are impossible to make in a timely way. College programs provide the only alternative to an immediate source of such equipment, on a temporary loan basis, allowing affected high schools to salvage their rowing season.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Moot in Divisions I and II. Adopted by Division III.

#### NO. 125 (NO. 2-117) RECRUITING — FIELD HOCKEY DEAD PERIOD

**Intent:** In the sport of Division I field hockey, to specify that the Wednesday prior to the NCAA Division I Field Hockey Championship game to noon on the day after the game shall be a dead period.

**Bylaws:** Amend 30.10.7 by adding new 30.10.7.2, page 421, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division I only]

**"30.10.7.2 Field Hockey, Division I Women — Wednesday prior to the National Collegiate Division I Field Hockey Championship to noon on the day after the game."**

**Source:** All members of the Ivy Group.

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Creating a dead period surrounding the NCAA Division I Field Hockey Championship and corresponding coaches' meet-



ings, which exists in basketball, men's ice hockey, softball and women's volleyball, will encourage greater participation of field hockey coaches in the championship events and related meetings.

**Committee Position (Recruiting Committee):** The committee supports this proposal.

**Action:** Moot in Division I.

### Deregulation

*The NCAA Legislative Review Committee identified the following proposals to facilitate the deregulation of the Association's amateurism/awards/benefits legislation. The NCAA Council approved the submission of these proposals to the membership as a "deregulation package." While these proposals were submitted as a package, they were voted on separately in the appropriate business session.*

#### NO. 126 (Dereg. 1) ATHLETICALLY RELATED EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES

**Intent:** To delete the legislation related to various athletically related employment activities, as specified, while retaining current restrictions related to fee-for-lesson instruction in Division I.

**A. Bylaws:** Amend 12.4.2, page 76, by deleting the current dominant voting requirement (\*) and substituting a federated voting requirement (I/II/III).

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

**B. Bylaws:** Amend 12.4.2, page 76, as follows:

[Division I only]

"12.4.2 Specific Athletically Related Employment Activities

"12.4.2.1 Coach or Physical Education Instructor. A student-athlete may serve as a coach or as an instructor for compensation in a physical education class outside the student-athlete's institution in which the student-athlete teaches sports techniques or skills or both, but a student-athlete shall not be so employed if the employment is arranged by the student-athlete's institution or a representative of its athletics interests.

[12.4.2.2 renumbered as 12.4.2.1, unchanged.]

"12.4.2.3 Officiating Professional Sports Contests. A student-athlete may not officiate for compensation at games or contests involving teams that are members of or affiliated with a recognized professional sports organization. Officiating at other games or contests for compensation is permitted.

[12.4.2.4 renumbered as 12.4.2.2, unchanged.]

[12.4.2.4.1 renumbered as 12.4.2.2.1, unchanged.]

[12.4.2.5 and 12.4.2.6 renumbered as 12.4.2.3 and 12.4.2.4, unchanged.]

"12.4.2.7 Military-Duty Coaching. An individual on active duty in the military service and receiving compensation based on rank as a serviceman, without any consideration given to the fact that the individual is a coach of a sports team,

may coach at one of the United States service academies if he or she is assigned to do so as an official duty.

"12.4.2.8 Lifeguard and Ski Patrol. An individual may be employed as a lifeguard or as a member of a ski patrol without jeopardizing his or her eligibility under the Association's amateur rules."

**C. Bylaws:** Amend 12.4.2, page 76, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions II and III, divided vote]

"12.4.2 Specific Athletically Related Employment Activities

"12.4.2.1 Coach or Physical Education Instructor. A student-athlete may serve as a coach or as an instructor for compensation in a physical education class outside the student-athlete's institution in which the student-athlete teaches sports techniques or skills or both, but a student-athlete shall not be so employed if the employment is arranged by the student-athlete's institution or a representative of its athletics interests.

"12.4.2.2 Fee-for-Lesson Instruction. A student-athlete may not receive compensation for teaching or coaching sports skills or techniques in his or her sport on a fee-for-lesson basis. However, such employment is permitted prior to enrollment in a collegiate institution.

"12.4.2.3 Officiating Professional Sports Contests. A student-athlete may not officiate for compensation at games or contests involving teams that are members of or affiliated with a recognized professional sports organization. Officiating at other games or contests for compensation is permitted.

[12.4.2.4 renumbered as 12.4.2.1, unchanged.]

[12.4.2.4.1 renumbered as 12.4.2.1.1, unchanged.]

[12.4.2.5 and 12.4.2.6 renumbered as 12.4.2.2 and 12.4.2.3, unchanged.]

"12.4.2.7 Military-Duty Coaching. An individual on active duty in the military service and receiving compensation based on rank as a serviceman, without any consideration given to the fact that the individual is a coach of a sports team, may coach at one of the United States service academies if he or she is assigned to do so as an official duty.

"12.4.2.8 Lifeguard and Ski Patrol. An individual may be employed as a lifeguard or as a member of a ski patrol without jeopardizing his or her eligibility under the Association's amateur rules."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** In the spirit of deregulation, these regulations related to athletically related employment no longer are necessary. Any employment by a student-athlete will continue to be governed by Bylaw 12.4.1, which requires that compensation may be paid to a student-athlete only for work actually performed and at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for similar services. The Division I Steering Committee favored retaining the current restrictions related to fee-for-lesson instruction.

**Action:** Part A adopted. Part B adopted by Division I. Part C adopted by Divisions II and III.



**NO. 127 (Dereg. 2) FINANCIAL DONATIONS FROM OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS**

**Intent:** To specify that an institution may host and promote an athletics contest between two professional teams as a fund-raising activity for the institution and that the funds generated may be used in any manner determined by the institution.

**Bylaws:** Amend 12.6.1.6, pages 81-82, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"12.6.1.6 Revenues Derived From Pro-Am Events. The distribution of revenues from an event involving an intercollegiate athletics team and a professional sports team (e.g., a baseball game in which a member institution's team plays against a professional baseball team) or program event (e.g., golf, tennis) that results in a member institution's receiving a share of receipts from such a contest is permitted, provided the institution has a formal agreement with the professional sports team regarding the institution's guarantee or share of receipts and the contractual terms are consistent with agreements made by the professional team or individuals for similar collegiate or nonprofessional competition.

"12.6.1.6.1 Promotion of Professional Athletics Contests. A member institution may host and promote an athletics contest between two professional teams from recognized professional sports leagues as a fund-raising activity for the institution. All revenue generated from such an activity must be placed in the institution's general scholarship fund for the assistance of students generally. In addition, a member institution is permitted to:

- "(a) Promote and generate revenues from contests or events involving 'sports activities' (e.g., Harlem Globetrotters, professional wrestlers);
- "(b) Utilize a closed-circuit telecast of a professional athletics event at the institution's facility to raise revenue, provided the telecast does not involve professional teams from a recognized professional league;
- "(c) Charge a professional team or organization with a rental rate for the use of its facilities that involves a percentage of the gross revenue and concessions from the event, provided the rental rate is consistent with the institution's 'normal rental agreement;' and
- "(d) Conduct an intrasquad game following a contest between two professional teams, provided the events are promoted independently of each other (e.g., no arrangement is made for reciprocal tickets) and the arena is cleared between contests.

"12.6.1.6.1.1 Use of Revenue. Revenue generated from the activities specified in (a) through (d) above may be utilized in any manner determined by the institution (e.g., placed in the athletics scholarship fund)."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The practice of promoting and hosting professional athletics contests as a way of raising funds for the institution has become and will continue to become more common. Institutions

should be allowed more latitude in this area.

**Action:** Adopted.

**NO. 128 (Dereg. 3) AWARDS — INSIGNIA AND PERSONALIZATION**

**Intent:** To delete the requirement that awards received by student-athletes must include an appropriate institutional insignia or letter, event specification, or comparable identification.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.1.2 and 16.1.3, page 210, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

**"16.1.2 Permissible Awards**

"16.1.2.1 Insignia and Personalization. All awards except those received prior to enrollment (see 16.1.1.1) and when the student-athlete is not regularly enrolled (see 16.1.1.3) must include an appropriate institutional insignia or letter, event specification, or comparable identification.

[16.1.2.2 renumbered as 16.1.2.1, unchanged.]

"16.1.3 Nonpermissible Awards. The following awards are prohibited unless received per 16.1.1.1 or 16.1.1.3, except that receipt of a cash award is not permitted under any circumstance.

[16.1.3.1 unchanged.]

"16.1.3.2 Merchandise Gift Certificates. Gift certificates and merchandise items that cannot be properly personalized shall be prohibited."

[Remainder of 16.1.3 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Awards for student-athletes are heavily regulated. The legislation listing examples of awards that could not be properly personalized (e.g., television sets) was eliminated as part of the revision of the NCAA Manual in 1989. It no longer seems necessary to retain the requirement that awards must be properly personalized, especially given the fact that there will continue to be limitations on the number and value of awards received by student-athletes. One reason for the requirement that awards be properly personalized was that it would prevent the awards from being resold; however, the awards can be resold whether they are personalized or not, and the personalization (to the event) may make the resale value greater.

**Action:** Adopted.

**NO. 129 (Dereg. 4) AWARDS LIMITATIONS**

[Note: In order to assist members in following the substantial number of changes in this proposal, it was presented in a nontraditional format as a chart.]

**Intent:** To increase the Association's awards limitations as specified.



**Bylaws:** Amend 16.1.4, pages 210-212, as follows:  
[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

BYLAW CITE	CURRENT DOLLAR LIMITATION	DATE LEGISLATION LAST MODIFIED	RECOMMENDED NEW AMOUNT
<b>"ANNUAL PARTICIPATION AWARDS"</b>			
16.1.4.1.1 (underclassman awards)	\$100	1980	<b>\$150</b>
16.1.4.1.2 (senior awards)	\$200	1980	<b>\$300</b>
16.1.4.1.3 (additional awards)	\$100	1988	<b>\$150</b>
<b>"SPECIAL EVENTS AND BOWLS"</b>			
16.1.4.2.1 (special events)	\$300	1982	\$300
16.1.4.2.2 (NCAA championships)	\$300	1991	\$300
16.1.4.2.3 (MVP award—special event)	\$250	1988	<b>\$300</b>
16.1.4.2.4 (bowl/all-star game)	\$300	1992	\$300
<b>"CONFERENCE AND NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS"</b>			
16.1.4.3 (conference and national championships)	\$250 conf.	1988	<b>\$300</b>
	\$300 natl.	1985	\$300
16.1.4.3.1 (non-NCAA championship)	\$300	1985	\$300
<b>"OTHER AWARDS"</b>			
16.1.4.4 (specialized performance)	\$50	1982	<b>\$75</b>
16.1.4.5 (home-town award)	\$50	1987	<b>\$75</b>

**Source:** NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee and Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** These increases in the Association's awards limitations have been recommended by the Committee on Financial Aid and Amateurism. The revised awards limits adjust for inflation and

reflect the increase in the Producers Price Index (PPI) since the last time the specific awards limits were modified. The awards limits also have been standardized into three (\$75, \$150 and \$300) levels.

**Action:** Adopted.

#### NO. 130 (Dereg. 5) AWARDS — SPECIAL EVENTS AND BOWLS

**Intent:** To specify that an established national award received by a student-athlete is not subject to the \$300 value limitation.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.1.4.2, page 211, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"16.1.4.2 Special Events and Bowls. Awards for participation in special events (such as postseason football games, NCAA championships and other established meets and tournaments, all-star games, featured individual competition) and established regional or national recognition awards (e.g., Wade Trophy, Heisman Trophy) may be presented only by the management of such an event or awards program or by an institution that has had or will have a team or individual participate in that event.

"16.1.4.2.1 Number and Value of Awards. The total value of any single award to any one student-athlete for a special event may not exceed \$300, except awards presented by the Association to student-athletes for participation in NCAA championship events per 16.1.4.2.2 and for most-valuable-player awards per 16.1.4.2.3. Multiple awards may be presented only by the institution and the management of the event if the total value of all awards presented for participation in the meet (e.g., a multievent winner in a gymnastics or track and field meet) or in honor of the student-athlete's achievement does not exceed \$300, except for bowl-game and all-star game awards per 16.1.4.2.4.

**"16.1.4.2.1.1 Exception — Established National Award. Trophies signifying an established national award may be received by a student-athlete, regardless of the value of the trophy."**

[Remainder of 16.1.4.2 unchanged.]

**Source:** NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** It is believed that the value of some of the current national awards (e.g., Heisman Trophy) exceeds the \$300 limitation. This legislation would permit the continued receipt of those awards.

**Action:** Adopted.



## NO. 131 (Dereg. 6) AWARDS BANQUETS

**Intent:** To indicate that an institution may conduct awards banquets at its discretion to commemorate the athletics and/or academic accomplishments of its student-athletes and to remove the time limit related to booster club recognition banquets.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.1.6, pages 212-213, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

**"16.1.6 Institutional Awards Banquets. An institution may conduct awards banquets to commemorate the athletics and/or academic accomplishments of its student-athletes.**

*"16.1.6.1 Postseason Awards Banquet — Single Team. An institution may conduct a postseason team award or recognition meeting to honor one of its intercollegiate athletics teams. The following regulations shall apply to such an event:*

- "(a) It is held at the conclusion of the sport season;*
- "(b) It is held to commemorate the accomplishments of the team and individual student-athletes;*
- "(c) It is conducted by and subject to the control of the member institution;*
- "(d) It is held within 100 miles of the institution's main campus and within the same state;*
- "(e) Only one such event is held per season per team; and*
- "(f) Only the institution or representatives of its athletics interests (through the institution) may provide expenses for the event.*

*"16.1.6.2 Postseason Awards Banquet — All Sports. An institution may conduct an annual all-sports banquet or meeting to honor all of its intercollegiate athletics teams. The following regulations shall apply to such an event:*

- "(a) It is held to commemorate the accomplishments of the teams and individual student-athletes;*
- "(b) It is conducted by and subject to the control of the member institution;*
- "(c) It is held within 100 miles of the institution's main campus and within the same state;*
- "(d) Only one such event is held per year; and*
- "(e) Only the institution or representatives of its athletics interests (through the institution) may provide expenses for the event.*

*"16.1.6.3 Academic Awards Banquet — All Sports. An institution may conduct an annual academic awards or recognition banquet or meeting to honor members of its intercollegiate athletics teams for academic achievements. The following regulations shall apply to such an event:*

- "(a) It is held to commemorate the academic accomplishments of individual student-athletes;*
- "(b) It is conducted by and subject to the control of the member institution;*
- "(c) It is held within 100 miles of the institution's main campus and within the same state;*
- "(d) Only one such event is held per year;*
- "(e) Any award presented to a student-athlete must conform with the restriction set forth in 16.1.4.1.3; and*
- "(f) Only the institution or representatives of its athletics interests (through the institution) may provide expenses for the event.*

**"16.1.6.4 16.1.6.1 Booster Club Recognition Banquet. One time per year, an institution's athletics booster club may finance an intercollegiate team's transportation expenses to a recognition banquet that occurs prior to or during the season, provided all expenses are paid through the institution's athletics department, the location of the event is not more than 100 miles from the campus and no tangible award is provided to members of the team."**

**Source:** NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** The legislation related to awards banquets generates numerous questions and has resulted in a number of interpretations. It seems appropriate that an institution should have the discretion to determine the number and type of awards banquets it wishes to conduct to recognize the athletics and/or academic accomplishments of its student-athletes while maintaining a limit on the number of booster-club recognition banquets.

**Action:** Adopted.

## NO. 132 (Dereg. 7) FOREIGN-TOUR EXPENSES

**Intent:** To increase from \$10 to \$20 the per diem a student-athlete may receive for incidental expenses in connection with a foreign tour.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.9, page 221, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

### "16.9 FOREIGN-TOUR EXPENSES

**"16.9.1 Per Diem. An institution may provide a student-athlete \$10 \$20 cash per day to cover unitemized incidental expenses incurred in connection with a foreign tour in his or her particular sport. This expense allowance may be provided for each day of the tour, to a maximum of 21 days."**

[Remainder of 16.9 unchanged.]



**Source:** NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** At the 1995 NCAA Convention, the membership increased from \$10 to \$20 the per diem for student-athletes participating in an NCAA championship or certified postseason bowl game. There also is legislation being proposed for the 1996 Convention to increase expenses for student hosts in Bylaw 13 and to increase the awards limitations in Bylaw 16. It seems appropriate to also increase the per diem for student-athletes participating in a foreign tour.

**Action:** Adopted.

#### NO. 133 (Dereg. 8) PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

**Intent:** To permit student-athletes in Divisions I and II to use athletics ability to win a prize as part of a promotional activity without jeopardizing their eligibility.

**Bylaws:** Amend 16.12.1.5, page 225, as follows:

[Federated provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"16.12.1.5 Promotional Activity Prize. A student-athlete from a member institution, selected through a random drawing open to the general public or the student body, may receive a prize as part of a promotional activity conducted by a member institution or held on a member institution's campus only as specified in 16.12.1.5.1.

"16.12.1.5.1 Athletics Ability. Utilization of athletics ability (e.g., making a half-court basketball shot) to win such a prize affects a student-athlete's eligibility as follows:

"(a) In Division I, only in the sport in which the promotional contest or activity occurs;

"(b) In Division II, in all sports, and

"(c) In Divisions I, II and III, participation in the promotional contest or activity does not affect the student-athlete's eligibility."

**Source:** NCAA Council (Legislative Review Committee).

**Effective Date:** August 1, 1996.

**Rationale:** Conducting promotional contests in conjunction with member institutions' athletics contests as a way to promote and encourage attendance is a practice that seems to be increasing. As long as student-athletes truly are selected to participate in such contests on a random basis and the opportunity to participate is open to the general public, student-athletes should be al-

lowed to participate in and win a prize for such participation, even if athletics ability is used, without jeopardizing eligibility. Institutions should be trusted not to "set up" such promotional activities to permit the participation of student-athletes.

**Action:** Adopted by Divisions II and III.



## Roll-Call Voting

This is a summary of the 63 roll-call votes that were recorded at the 1996 Convention.

Each column represents a roll-call vote at the Convention. The number at the head of each column is the proposal number. Where letters are indicated, the reference is to parts of multipart proposals

included in that vote. Proposals considered in more than one business session are reported in separate columns labeled by division.

The label "MTR" indicates a motion to reconsider, "Rec" indicates a vote of reconsideration, and "Ref" indicates a motion to refer a proposal to a committee. The notation "Call" indicates a call of the question.

[illegible]



A-257



A-259



A-261



A-263



A-265



Member	Dir.	7	7-1	7-10	7-13	7-14	7-2	7-3	7-5	7-6	7-8	7-9	7-10	7-11	7-12	7-13	7-14	7-15	7-16	7-17	7-18	7-19	7-20	7-21	7-22	7-23	7-24	7-25	7-26	7-27	7-28	7-29	7-30	7-31	7-32	7-33	7-34	7-35	7-36	7-37	7-38	7-39	7-40	7-41	7-42	7-43	7-44	7-45	7-46	7-47	7-48	7-49	7-50	7-51	7-52	7-53	7-54	7-55	7-56	7-57	7-58	7-59	7-60	7-61	7-62	7-63	7-64	7-65	7-66	7-67	7-68	7-69	7-70	7-71	7-72	7-73	7-74	7-75	7-76	7-77	7-78	7-79	7-80	7-81	7-82	7-83	7-84	7-85	7-86	7-87	7-88	7-89	7-90	7-91	7-92	7-93	7-94	7-95	7-96	7-97	7-98	7-99	7-100	7-101	7-102	7-103	7-104	7-105	7-106	7-107	7-108	7-109	7-110	7-111	7-112	7-113	7-114	7-115	7-116	7-117	7-118	7-119	7-120	7-121	7-122	7-123	7-124	7-125	7-126	7-127	7-128	7-129	7-130	7-131	7-132	7-133	7-134	7-135	7-136	7-137	7-138	7-139	7-140	7-141	7-142	7-143	7-144	7-145	7-146	7-147	7-148	7-149	7-150	7-151	7-152	7-153	7-154	7-155	7-156	7-157	7-158	7-159	7-160	7-161	7-162	7-163	7-164	7-165	7-166	7-167	7-168	7-169	7-170	7-171	7-172	7-173	7-174	7-175	7-176	7-177	7-178	7-179	7-180	7-181	7-182	7-183	7-184	7-185	7-186	7-187	7-188	7-189	7-190	7-191	7-192	7-193	7-194	7-195	7-196	7-197	7-198	7-199	7-200	7-201	7-202	7-203	7-204	7-205	7-206	7-207	7-208	7-209	7-210	7-211	7-212	7-213	7-214	7-215	7-216	7-217	7-218	7-219	7-220	7-221	7-222	7-223	7-224	7-225	7-226	7-227	7-228	7-229	7-230	7-231	7-232	7-233	7-234	7-235	7-236	7-237	7-238	7-239	7-240	7-241	7-242	7-243	7-244	7-245	7-246	7-247	7-248	7-249	7-250	7-251	7-252	7-253	7-254	7-255	7-256	7-257	7-258	7-259	7-260	7-261	7-262	7-263	7-264	7-265	7-266	7-267	7-268	7-269	7-270	7-271	7-272	7-273	7-274	7-275	7-276	7-277	7-278	7-279	7-280	7-281	7-282	7-283	7-284	7-285	7-286	7-287	7-288	7-289	7-290	7-291	7-292	7-293	7-294	7-295	7-296	7-297	7-298	7-299	7-300	7-301	7-302	7-303	7-304	7-305	7-306	7-307	7-308	7-309	7-310	7-311	7-312	7-313	7-314	7-315	7-316	7-317	7-318	7-319	7-320	7-321	7-322	7-323	7-324	7-325	7-326	7-327	7-328	7-329	7-330	7-331	7-332	7-333	7-334	7-335	7-336	7-337	7-338	7-339	7-340	7-341	7-342	7-343	7-344	7-345	7-346	7-347	7-348	7-349	7-350	7-351	7-352	7-353	7-354	7-355	7-356	7-357	7-358	7-359	7-360	7-361	7-362	7-363	7-364	7-365	7-366	7-367	7-368	7-369	7-370	7-371	7-372	7-373	7-374	7-375	7-376	7-377	7-378	7-379	7-380	7-381	7-382	7-383	7-384	7-385	7-386	7-387	7-388	7-389	7-390	7-391	7-392	7-393	7-394	7-395	7-396	7-397	7-398	7-399	7-400	7-401	7-402	7-403	7-404	7-405	7-406	7-407	7-408	7-409	7-410	7-411	7-412	7-413	7-414	7-415	7-416	7-417	7-418	7-419	7-420	7-421	7-422	7-423	7-424	7-425	7-426	7-427	7-428	7-429	7-430	7-431	7-432	7-433	7-434	7-435	7-436	7-437	7-438	7-439	7-440	7-441	7-442	7-443	7-444	7-445	7-446	7-447	7-448	7-449	7-450	7-451	7-452	7-453	7-454	7-455	7-456	7-457	7-458	7-459	7-460	7-461	7-462	7-463	7-464	7-465	7-466	7-467	7-468	7-469	7-470	7-471	7-472	7-473	7-474	7-475	7-476	7-477	7-478	7-479	7-480	7-481	7-482	7-483	7-484	7-485	7-486	7-487	7-488	7-489	7-490	7-491	7-492	7-493	7-494	7-495	7-496	7-497	7-498	7-499	7-500	7-501	7-502	7-503	7-504	7-505	7-506	7-507	7-508	7-509	7-510	7-511	7-512	7-513	7-514	7-515	7-516	7-517	7-518	7-519	7-520	7-521	7-522	7-523	7-524	7-525	7-526	7-527	7-528	7-529	7-530	7-531	7-532	7-533	7-534	7-535	7-536	7-537	7-538	7-539	7-540	7-541	7-542	7-543	7-544	7-545	7-546	7-547	7-548	7-549	7-550	7-551	7-552	7-553	7-554	7-555	7-556	7-557	7-558	7-559	7-560	7-561	7-562	7-563	7-564	7-565	7-566	7-567	7-568	7-569	7-570	7-571	7-572	7-573	7-574	7-575	7-576	7-577	7-578	7-579	7-580	7-581	7-582	7-583	7-584	7-585	7-586	7-587	7-588	7-589	7-590	7-591	7-592	7-593	7-594	7-595	7-596	7-597	7-598	7-599	7-600	7-601	7-602	7-603	7-604	7-605	7-606	7-607	7-608	7-609	7-610	7-611	7-612	7-613	7-614	7-615	7-616	7-617	7-618	7-619	7-620	7-621	7-622	7-623	7-624	7-625	7-626	7-627	7-628	7-629	7-630	7-631	7-632	7-633	7-634	7-635	7-636	7-637	7-638	7-639	7-640	7-641	7-642	7-643	7-644	7-645	7-646	7-647	7-648	7-649	7-650	7-651	7-652	7-653	7-654	7-655	7-656	7-657	7-658	7-659	7-660	7-661	7-662	7-663	7-664	7-665	7-666	7-667	7-668	7-669	7-670	7-671	7-672	7-673	7-674	7-675	7-676	7-677	7-678	7-679	7-680	7-681	7-682	7-683	7-684	7-685	7-686	7-687	7-688	7-689	7-690	7-691	7-692	7-693	7-694	7-695	7-696	7-697	7-698	7-699	7-700	7-701	7-702	7-703	7-704	7-705	7-706	7-707	7-708	7-709	7-710	7-711	7-712	7-713	7-714	7-715	7-716	7-717	7-718	7-719	7-720	7-721	7-722	7-723	7-724	7-725	7-726	7-727	7-728	7-729	7-730	7-731	7-732	7-733	7-734	7-735	7-736	7-737	7-738	7-739	7-740	7-741	7-742	7-743	7-744	7-745	7-746	7-747	7-748	7-749	7-750	7-751	7-752	7-753	7-754	7-755	7-756	7-757	7-758	7-759	7-760	7-761	7-762	7-763	7-764	7-765	7-766	7-767	7-768	7-769	7-770	7-771	7-772	7-773	7-774	7-775	7-776	7-777	7-778	7-779	7-780	7-781	7-782	7-783	7-784	7-785	7-786	7-787	7-788	7-789	7-790	7-791	7-792	7-793	7-794	7-795	7-796	7-797	7-798	7-799	7-800	7-801	7-802	7-803	7-804	7-805	7-806	7-807	7-808	7-809	7-810	7-811	7-812	7-813	7-814	7-815	7-816	7-817	7-818	7-819	7-820	7-821	7-822	7-823	7-824	7-825	7-826	7-827	7-828	7-829	7-830	7-831	7-832	7-833	7-834	7-835	7-836	7-837	7-838	7-839	7-840	7-841	7-842	7-843	7-844	7-845	7-846	7-847	7-848	7-849	7-850	7-851	7-852	7-853	7-854	7-855	7-856	7-857	7-858	7-859	7-860	7-861	7-862	7-863	7-864	7-865	7-866	7-867	7-868	7-869	7-870	7-871	7-872	7-873	7-874	7-875	7-876	7-877	7-878	7-879	7-880	7-881	7-882	7-883	7-884	7-885	7-886	7-887	7-888	7-889	7-890	7-891	7-892	7-893	7-894	7-895	7-896	7-897	7-898	7-899	7-900	7-901	7-902	7-903	7-904	7-905	7-906	7-907	7-908	7-909	7-910	7-911	7-912	7-913	7-914	7-915	7-916	7-917	7-918	7-919	7-920	7-921	7-922	7-923	7-924	7-925	7-926	7-927	7-928	7-929	7-930	7-931	7-932	7-933	7-934	7-935	7-936	7-937	7-938	7-939	7-940	7-941	7-942	7-943	7-944	7-945	7-946	7-947	7-948	7-949	7-950	7-951	7-952	7-953	7-954	7-955	7-956	7-957	7-958	7-959	7-960	7-961	7-962	7-963	7-964	7-965	7-966	7-967	7-968	7-969	7-970	7-971	7-972	7-973	7-974	7-975	7-976	7-977	7-978	7-979	7-980	7-981	7-982	7-983	7-984	7-985	7-986	7-987	7-988	7-989	7-990	7-991	7-992	7-993	7-994	7-995	7-996	7-997	7-998	7-999	7-1000	7-1001	7-1002	7-1003	7-1004	7-1005	7-1006	7-1007	7-1008	7-1009	7-1010	7-1011	7-1012	7-1013	7-1014	7-1015	7-1016	7-1017	7-1018	7-1019	7-1020	7-1021	7-1022	7-1023	7-1024	7-1025	7-1026	7-1027	7-1028	7-1029	7-1030	7-1031	7-1032	7-1033	7-1034	7-1035	7-1036	7-1037	7-1038	7-1039	7-1040	7-1041	7-1042	7-1043	7-1044	7-1045	7-1046	7-1047	7-1048	7-1049	7-1050	7-1051	7-1052	7-1053	7-1054	7-1055	7-1056	7-1057	7-1058	7-1059	7-1060	7-1061	7-1062	7-1063	7-1064	7-1065	7-1066	7-1067	7-1068	7-1069	7-1070	7-1071	7-1072	7-1073	7-1074	7-1075	7-1076	7-1077	7-1078	7-1079	7-1080	7-1081	7-1082	7-1083	7-1084	7-1085	7-1086	7-1087	7-1088	7-1089	7-1090	7-1091	7-1092	7-1093	7-1094	7-1095	7-1096	7-1097	7-1098	7-1099	7-1100	7-1101	7-1102	7-1103	7-1104	7-1105	7-1106	7-1107	7-1108	7-1109	7-1110	7-1111	7-1112	7-1113	7-1114	7-1115	7-1116	7-1117	7-1118	7-1119	7-1120	7-1121	7-1122	7-1123	7-1124	7-1125	7-1126	7-1127	7-1128	7-1129	7-1130	7-1131	7-1132	7-1133	7-1134	7-1135	7-1136	7-1137	7-1138	7-1139	7-1140	7-1141	7-1142	7-1143	7-1144	7-1145	7-1146	7-1147	7-1148	7-1149	7-1150	7-1151	7-1152	7-1153	7-1154	7-1155	7-1156	7-1157	7-1158	7-1159	7-1160	7-1161	7-1162	7-1163	7-1164	7-1165	7-1166	7-1167	7-1168	7-1169	7-1170	7-1171	7-1172	7-1173	7-1174	7-1175	7-1176	7-1177	7-1178	7-1179	7-1180	7-1181	7-1182	7-1183	7-1184	7-1185	7-1186	7-1187	7-1188	7-1189	7-1190	7-1191	7-1192	7-1193	7-1194	7-1195	7-1196	7-1197	7-1198	7-1199	7-1200	7-1201	7-1202	7-1203	7-1204	7-1205	7-1206	7-1207	7-1208	7-1209	7-1210	7-1211	7-1212	7-1213	7-1214	7-1215	7-1216	7-1217	7-1218	7-1219	7-1220	7-1221
--------	------	---	-----	------	------	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------



A-269



A-271



[illegible]

**No. 7** — Parts A, B, D, H, I, Q, S, T, U, X, Y, BB, CC, DD, II adopted, 779-79-1. Part F adopted as amended by No. 7-1, 755-13. Part J adopted as amended by No. 7-14, 784-30-4. Parts C, E and JJ adopted (Division I, 320-6-1; Division II, 233-5-1; Division III, 281-4-1). Part KK adopted, 733-14-1. Parts L, O, R, AA, FF and HH adopted by Division II, 245-1-1. Parts M, P, R, AA, FF and HH adopted by Division III, paddle vote. Part G adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 7-2 and 7-3, 325-1. Part K adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 7-5-A and 7-6-A, 311-16. Part N adopted in Division I as amended by Nos. 7-5-B and 7-6-B, 310-4. Part R adopted by Division I, 312-1. Part Z adopted by Division I as amended by No. 7-9-A, 265-2-4. Part EE adopted by Division I, 308-3-1. Part GG adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 7-9-B, 7-10, 7-12 and 7-13, 316-3. Part V adopted by Division I-A, 115-0. Part W adopted by Division I-AA, 122-1. **No. 7-1** — Adopted, 829-10-3. **No. 7-2** — Adopted by Division I, 321-4. **No. 7-3** — Adopted by Division I, 326-1. **No. 7-5** — Part A adopted by Division I, 325-1. Part B adopted by Division I, 323-1-2. **No. 7-6** — Part A adopted by Division I, 318-0. Part B adopted by Division I, 324-0. **No. 7-9** — Part A adopted by Division I, 297-28-1. Part B adopted by Division I, 307-12-2. **No. 7-10** — Adopted by Division I, 323-0-1. **No. 7-12** — Adopted by Division I, 320-3. **No. 7-13** — Adopted by Division I, 311-12. **No. 7-14** — Adopted, 762-30-6. **No. 9** — Adopted by Division I, 314-4-3.

**No. 10** — Adopted, 660-115-30. **No. 11** — Adopted, 802-1. **No. 12** — Adopted by Division I, 312-5. **No. 13** — Adopted, 814-5-1. **No. 14** — Adopted, 817-3-3. **No. 15** — Adopted, 614-168-35. **No. 16** — Motion to refer defeated by Division II, 93-147-4. Immediate effective date for Part H defeated, 115-131-4. Proposal defeated, 73-176-3. **No. 18** — Defeated by Division I, 150-178. **No. 19** — Defeated upon reconsideration by Division I, 161-163-6. **No. 20** — Defeated by Division I, 102-220-6. **No. 21** — Defeated by Division I, 122-196-2. **No. 23** — Part A adopted as amended by No. 23-2-A (Division I-A, 82-27-2; Division I-AA, 75-40-3). Part B adopted by Division I as amended by No. 23-2-B, 236-73-7. **No. 23-2** — Part A adopted by Division I-A, 68-46-1; adopted upon reconsideration by Division I-AA, 114-12-1. Part B adopted by Division I, 176-135-6. **No. 24** — Adopted by Division I as amended by Nos. 24-1 and 24-2, 300-20. **No. 24-1** — Adopted by Division I, 262-54-1. **No. 24-2** — Adopted by Division I, 251-62-3. **No. 26** — Adopted by Division II, 172-74. **No. 27** — Referred by Division I to Academic Requirements and Two-Year College Relations Committees, 257-57. Not moved in Division II. **No. 28** — Defeated by Division I, 61-290-9. **No. 28-1** — Defeated by Division I, 139-178-13. **No. 31** — Defeated by Division I, 120-198-6. **No. 33** — Adopted by Division I, 203-113-8. **No. 34** — Defeated by Division I-A upon reconsideration, 43-68-7. Not moved by other Division I members. **No. 35** — Defeated by Division I, 97-216.



## Appendix C

### 90th Annual Convention Committees

#### Nominating Committee

Chair—Claudius E. Watts III

- I-1—Eugene B. DeFilippo, Villanova University
- I-1—Don J. DiJulia, St. Joseph's University (Pennsylvania)
- I-2—Mikki Flowers, Old Dominion University
- I-2—Claudius E. Watts III, The Citadel
- I-3—Mildred B. Griggs, University of Illinois, Champaign
- I-3—Robert R. Snell, Kansas State University
- I-4—Thomas F. Davis, Sam Houston State University
- I-4—Charles Whitcomb, San Jose State University
- II-1—Marjorie A. Trout, Millersville University of Pennsylvania
- II-2—Clint Bryant, Augusta College
- II-3—Jane Meier, Northern Kentucky University
- II-4—Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University
- III-1—Arthur Eason, William Paterson College
- III-2—Jenepher P. Shillingford, Bryn Mawr College
- III-3—Porter Miller, Earlham College
- III-4—Bridget Belgiovine, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse

#### Men's Committee on Committees

Chair—William T. "Todd" Turner

- District 1—John C. Harper, Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts)
- District 2—Hank Ford, Alfred University
- District 3—William T. "Todd" Turner, North Carolina State University
- District 4—Archie Griffin, Ohio State University
- District 5—Willard S. Belknap, Wichita State University
- District 6—Bradford W. Hovious, Arkansas State University
- District 7—Gene A. Bleymaier, Boise State University
- District 8—David A. Jacobs, Whittier College
- At Large—James Fallis, University of Northern Colorado
- At Large—Nathan N. Salant, Gulf South Conference
- At Large—Ronald J. English, Ohio Valley Conference
- At Large—William E. Lide, West Chester University of Pennsylvania

#### Women's Committee on Committees

Chair—Sharon E. Taylor

- District 1—Deborah Chin, University of New Haven
- District 2—Sharon E. Taylor, Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
- District 3—Judy Rose, University of North Carolina, Charlotte
- District 4—Christine H. B. Grant, University of Iowa
- District 5—Betsy G. Stephenson, University of Kansas
- District 6—Catherine A. Beene, University of Texas at Arlington
- District 7—Marilyn Moniz-Kaho'ohanohano, University of Hawaii, Manoa
- District 8—To be appointed
- At Large—Carla Coffey, Smith College

- At Large—Dianne "Dee" Fairchild, Grinnell College
- At Large—Dianne Jones, University of Wisconsin, Whitewater
- At Large—P. LaVerne Sweat, Norfolk State University

#### Voting Committee

Chair—Larry R. Gerlach

- District 1—Debi Field McGrath, Colby-Sawyer College
- District 2—Col. Albert Vanderbush, U.S. Military Academy
- District 3—To be appointed
- District 4—Hugh A. Wolf, Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis
- District 5—Jean Berger, Drake University
- District 6—Barbara Jacket, Prairie View A&M University
- District 7—Jack L. Bishop, Southern Utah University
- District 8—Albert T. Gonzales, University of Utah
- At Large—Larry R. Gerlach, University of Utah
- At Large—Donald Harnum, Susquehanna University
- At Large—Betsy J. Mosher, Northwestern University
- At Large—Hallie E. Gregory, University of Maryland, Eastern Shore
- At Large—Alan J. White, Elon College

#### Memorial Resolutions Committee

Chair—Barbara Hick

- Connie Foster, University of Wisconsin, River Falls
- Barbara Hick, St. Bonaventure University
- Jo Spearman, Mississippi University for Women

#### Credentials Committee

Chair—Joseph A. Etzel

- Susan R. Larkin, John Jay College of Criminal Justice
- Joseph A. Etzel, University of Portland
- Mark Fohl, University of Minnesota, Morris

#### Parliamentarian

Alan J. Chapman, Rice University



## Appendix D

### Past Convention Sites

Convention	Year	City, Hotel
1st	1906	New York City (Murray Hill)
2nd	1907	New York City (Murray Hill)
3rd	1908	New York City (Murray Hill)
4th	1909	New York City (Murray Hill)
5th	1910	New York City (Astor)
6th	1911	New York City (Astor)
7th	1912	New York City (Astor)
8th	1913	New York City (Astor)
9th	1914	Chicago (LaSalle)
10th	1915	New York City (Astor)
11th	1916	New York City (Astor)
12th	1917	New York City (Astor)
13th	1918	New York City (Astor)
14th	1919	New York City (Astor)
15th	1920	Chicago (Sherman)
16th	1921	New York City (Astor)
17th	1922	New York City (Astor)
18th	1923	Atlanta (Georgian Terrace)
19th	1924	New York City (Astor)
20th	1925	New York City (Astor)
21st	1926	New York City (Astor)
22nd	1927	New York City (Astor)
23rd	1928	New Orleans (Roosevelt)
24th	1929*	New York City (Astor)
25th	1930	New York City (Astor)
26th	1931	New York City (Astor)
27th	1932	New York City (Astor)
28th	1933	Chicago (Stevens)
29th	1934	New York City (Pennsylvania)
30th	1935	New York City (Pennsylvania)
31st	1936	New York City (Pennsylvania)
32nd	1937	New Orleans (St. Charles)
33rd	1938	Chicago (Sherman)
34th	1939	Los Angeles (Biltmore)
35th	1940	New York City (New Yorker)
36th	1941	Detroit (Book-Cadillac)
37th	1942	New York City (Astor)
	1943	No meeting
38th	1944†	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)

\*Convened January 1, 1930.

†Officers, Executive Committee and chairs of rules committee only.

46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellyue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fountainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fountainebleau Hilton)
4th Special	1981	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront)
76th	1982	Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983	San Diego (Town and Country)
78th	1984	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
79th	1985	Nashville (Opryland)
5th Special	1985	New Orleans (Hyatt Regency)
80th	1986	New Orleans (Hilton Riverside)
81st	1987	San Diego (Town and Country)
6th Special	1987	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
82nd	1988	Nashville (Opryland)
83rd	1989	San Francisco (Hilton)
84th	1990	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
85th	1991	Nashville (Opryland)
86th	1992	Anaheim (Hilton and Towers)
87th	1993	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
88th	1994	San Antonio (Marriott Rivercenter)
89th	1995	San Diego (San Diego Convention Center)



## Appendix E

### NCAA Officers, 1906-1996

Years      Name, Institution

#### President

1906-1913—Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy  
 1914-1916—LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University  
 1917-1929—Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy  
 1930-1932—Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University  
 1933-1937—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)  
 1938-1940—William B. Owens, Stanford University  
 1941-1944—Phillip O. Badger, New York University  
 1945-1946—Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University,  
 University of Wyoming  
 1947-1949—Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa  
 1950-1952—Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California  
 1953-1954—Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa  
 1955-1956—Clarence P. Houston, Tufts University  
 1957-1958—Frank N. Gardner, Drake University  
 1959-1960—Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College (Colorado)  
 1961-1962—Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University  
 1963-1964—Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa  
 1965-1966—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University  
 1967-1968—Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan  
 1969-1970—Harry M. Cross, University of Washington  
 1971-1972—Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville  
 1973-1974—Alan J. Chapman, Rice University  
 1975-1976—John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University  
 1977-1978—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas at Austin  
 1979-1980—William J. Flynn, Boston College  
 1981-1982—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)  
 1983-1984—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut  
 1985-1986—John R. Davis, Oregon State University  
 1987-1988—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University  
 1989-1990—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville  
 1991-1992—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego  
 1993-1995—Joseph N. Crowley, University of Nevada  
 1996—Eugene F. Corrigan, Atlantic Coast Conference

#### Secretary-Treasurer

1906-1908—Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick  
 1908—William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia  
 (Treasurer only)  
 1909-1939—Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University  
 1940-1944—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)  
 1945-1951—Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)  
 1952-1954—Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln  
 1955-1956—Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan  
 1957-1958—Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University  
 1959-1960—Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University

1961-1962—Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University  
 1963-1964—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University  
 1965-1966—Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines  
 1967-1968—Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University  
 1969-1970—William J. Flynn, Boston College  
 1971-1972—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University,  
 University of District of Columbia

1973-1974—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University  
 1975-1976—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University  
 1977-1978—Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingham College  
 1979-1980—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)  
 1981-1982—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut  
 1983-1984—John R. Davis, Oregon State University  
 1985-1986—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University  
 1987-1988—Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton  
 1989-1990—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego  
 1991-1992—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University  
 1993—Cedric W. Dempsey, University of Arizona  
 1994-1995—Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference

#### Division I Vice-President

1983-1984—Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University  
 1985—Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University  
 1986—Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association  
 1987-1988—Albert M. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville  
 1989-1990—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University  
 1991—Douglas S. Hobbs, University of California, Los Angeles  
 1992-1993—R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton  
 1994-1995—William M. Sangster, Georgia Institute of Technology  
 1996—Robert M. Sweazy, Texas Tech University

#### Division II Vice-President

1983—Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska Fairbanks  
 1984-1985—Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University  
 1986—Asa N. Green, Livingston University  
 1987-1988—Howard Elwell, Gannon University  
 1989-1990—Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University  
 1991-1992—Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University  
 of Pennsylvania

1993-1995—Charles N. Lindemann, Humboldt State University  
 1996—Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University

#### Division III Vice-President

1983—Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)  
 1984-1985—Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College  
 1986-1987—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego  
 1988-1989—Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster  
 1990-1991—Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University  
 1992-1993—John H. Harvey, Carnegie Mellon University  
 1994-1995—Edward G. Coll Jr., Alfred University  
 1996—Bridget Belgiovine, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse



1NCAA00014958/



NCAA

